REGIS COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 05807927 8

247.3

BOR - 3457

REGIS
BIBL. MAJ.
COLLEGE

To J. Knox.
-with grateful remembrance
from
D.A.W.
Sept. 28th/94

ST. STANISLAUS NOVITIATE
HOUSE LIBRARY
GUELPH, ONT.
DISCARD

LECTURES
ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST

Nihil Obstat.

✠ FRANCISCUS CHEW, S.J.,
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimi potest.

✠ GULIELMUS,
EPISCOPUS ARINDELENSIS, V.G.

WESTMONASTERII,
Die 29 *Maii*, 1906.

LECTURES

ON THE

HOLY EUCHARIST

BY

CHARLES COUPE, S.J., M.A. (LONDON)

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, STONYHURST COLLEGE

REGIS
BIBL. MAJ.
COLLEGE

EDITED

WITH NOTES AND REFERENCES

BY

HATHERLEY MORE

ST. STANISLAUS NOVITIATE
HISTORICAL LIBRARY
GUELPH, ONT.

BX
2215
.C68
1906

R. & T. WASHBOURNE, LTD.

1, 2 & 4 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

BENZIGER BROS.: NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, AND CHICAGO

1906

64418

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE following set of sixteen lectures on the Holy Eucharist I have, with the author's leave, disentombed from various sources — English, Irish, and American—in which the course, or parts of it, had originally appeared.

Many reporter's errors, and hundreds of printer's blunders, I have corrected. I have also eliminated all such repetitions as must of necessity occur in verbatim reports of lectures which the speaker intended for the ear and not for the eye, for the hearer rather than for the reader.

For the notes and references I alone am responsible.

These, be it said, are essentially popular lectures. Consequently, the more recondite aspects of the profound subject, set forth with such lucidity, are but slightly touched on.

Moreover, the lectures, when delivered, were limited to time, and therefore make no claim to be exhaustive. Nor, as the speaker's object was exposition and not controversy, does he directly and formally attempt to confute the usual host of Protestant

objections; though, to a thoughtful mind, the exposition itself will easily suggest satisfactory answers.

The appearance of these lectures in book form will, I hope, prove acceptable to the public at large. Those especially who listened to them at the time of their delivery—whether in the North or in the South, for they have been often repeated—and who can remember the interest they excited, and the favour with which they were received, will doubtless be glad to have them in this permanent form, and will find the private perusal of only less utility than was the public hearing of them.

Our Holy Father has insisted much of late on the obvious, but too much neglected, duty of Christians to make better acquaintance with the essential dogmas of the Faith. A little volume like the present makes it possible for the busiest and least instructed to gain clear ideas concerning this vital mystery of religion—the Blessed Sacrament of the altar. Nor will the professed student find that the lecturer has failed to provide him—without, at the same time, mystifying readers of the more popular type—with ample matter for reflection.

Thus to crystallize into popular form Catholic doctrine — philosophy, dogma, and theology — concerning the Holy Eucharist, in these days when this mystery of religion is, alike by the erudite and by the man in the street, so largely misunderstood and so widely misrepresented, is certainly a boon. These lectures, unmarred by a single unkind word about opponents, march uncompromisingly in logical sequence from prophecy to fulfilment, from promise

to performance, from doctrine to dogma, from dogma to devotion. For from the mists of ancient prophecy they manuduct us into the full light of Christian fulfilment ; from the red altar-stone of typical Jewish sacrifice they lead us to the foot of the bloodless altar of the Immolated God, to that Emmanuel in Whom the types of old find their verification.

HATHERLEY MORE.

CONTENTS

PAGES

PREFACE - - - - - - - - v—vii

LECTURE I

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES OF THE MASS

The Mass foretold in the Old Testament—(A) The Order of Melchisedech—(B) The prophecy of Malachi—Five marks of the New Law: (i.) Catholicity, (ii.) Universal Priesthood, (iii.) Form of the Sacrifice, (iv.) Intrinsic Excellence, (v.) Glory given to God—The Mass is the fulfilment of the prophecy - - - - - - 1—18

LECTURE II

CHRIST'S PROMISE OF THE EUCHARIST—I.

The Real Presence promised in the Bible—The miraculous feeding of the five thousand was to prepare the Jews for the Eucharistic miracle—Christ walked on the sea to manifest His power over liquid, as by the miracle of the loaves He had done over solid matter—The Real Presence promised at Capharnaum—Christ's words are literal and not metaphorical - - - - - - 19—30

LECTURE III

CHRIST'S PROMISE OF THE EUCHARIST—II.

The choice between a literal and a figurative interpretation of Christ's words about eating His flesh—The inspired writers, SS. John, Luke, Paul, etc., never hint at a metaphor—Our Lord always explained His metaphorical language when it was taken literally—He expresses the

PAGES

truth concerning the Real Presence in every possible form, positive and negative—He is understood by the Jews in a literal and not metaphorical sense—An appeal to common-sense—The modern world still turns away from the dogma of the Real Presence - - 31—41

LECTURE IV

CHRIST'S INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST—I.

The evidence of this institution—The Guest Chamber in Jerusalem—The words of institution—Catholics stand by the plain words of Scripture—Opponents explain it away - - - - - - - 42—49

LECTURE V

CHRIST'S INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST—II.

Opponents urge that the words of institution are only figurative, like the words of promise—The inconsistency and absurdity of this objection—The danger of this line of argument—The whole question at issue—The words of institution unintelligible if metaphorical—Theophylact on these words—The objection that if the Eucharist be a memorial of Christ it cannot be Christ Himself—Farrar on the words of institution - - - - 50—62

LECTURE VI

ST. PAUL'S TESTIMONY: THE EUCHARIST AS AN INSTITUTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH

Bible records of the Eucharist as an existing institution of the Early Church—(A) St. Paul's evidence; the chalice of benediction; he addresses the Corinthian Christians; his reasons for forbidding them to eat of meals offered in sacrifice to devils; his words either mean the Real Presence in the Eucharist or are meaningless; he speaks of a Christian altar, and real sacrifice of a real Victim —(B) St. Paul speaks of the revelation he had received concerning the Eucharist, but mentions nothing about a metaphor; the Protestant 'Revised Version' of the New Testament; unworthy Communion; disrespect to mere symbols not deserving of eternal punishment; no pre-

PAGES

paration, such as confession or fasting, required before partaking of symbols; 'discerning the Body of the Lord' impossible if the Body be not there; the objection is urged that St. Paul speaks of 'bread' existing after the consecration; the argument summed up; the letter of Dr. Temple, and the Book of Common Prayer - 63—81

LECTURE VII

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

The *modus quo* and the *modus in quo*—The Council of Trent—The word 'transubstantiation'—Three points in the dogma of the Holy Eucharist which are of Divine and Catholic faith—Three theories (Impanation, Consubstantiation, and Transubstantiation) concerning the mode by which the Real Presence is effected—Transubstantiation the only true theory—Transubstantiation not an invention of the ninth century—Difficulties urged against it—The relations between, but not the nature of, matter and force can be known—The difficulties urged are not new—Difficulties in the natural and the supernatural order—Can two bodies occupy the same space at the same moment?—The atomic theory—Lord Kelvin *versus* Newton—The intrinsic impenetrability of matter—We can know nothing of substance by sense—The evidence for Transubstantiation not natural, but supernatural 82—102

LECTURE VIII

WHAT TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS

The word defined—What is understood by 'substance' and 'accidents'?—What is 'conversion'?—'Complete' conversion *versus* 'partial'—Transubstantiation is neither annihilation nor creation—Manning and Newman on the manner of Christ's existence in the Holy Eucharist 103—112

LECTURE IX

LEIBNITZ ON THE EUCHARIST

Who Leibnitz was—His views concerning the Mass—He cites the early Fathers to prove it is a real sacrifice—He admits and defends the doctrine of the Real Presence—He denies it to be a metaphysical necessity that the

PAGES

essence of a body should consist in extension—Descartes cannot prove that it does—Leibnitz denies the Consubstantiation theory to have been held in early times—Transubstantiation not opposed to the Protestant Confession of Augsburg—He cites St. Ambrose and others to explain why, after consecration, the accidents are still called bread and wine—The accidents of bread and wine do not inhere in Christ's Body and Blood after consecration—Transubstantiation is wrought at the very moment of consecration—Leibnitz holds that the doctrine of Transubstantiation involves no contradiction in terms, and is therefore not impossible—His views on 'substance' and 'mass'—The value of his testimony - - 113—135

LECTURE X

TESTIMONIES OF THE LITURGIES

Probably no public liturgy was committed to writing before 350 A.D.—All the liturgies were practically copies of three great originals: the Liturgy of Jerusalem, the Liturgy of Alexandria, the Roman Liturgy—Some of the derivatives from these three liturgies—The Alexandrian Liturgy—The Ambrosian Liturgy—Similar testimonies could be adduced from a large number of other liturgies—The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom—The four great doctrines: the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, unbloody sacrifice of a living Victim, and Divine worship of the Holy Eucharist, are clearly taught in these liturgies - 136—153

LECTURE XI

TESTIMONIES OF THE EARLY FATHERS TO THE REAL PRESENCE

Study of evidence limited to the first four centuries: St. Ignatius of Antioch in the first century; St. Paul is witness for the first half of this century—St. Justin Martyr, St. Irenæus, St. Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian in the second century—Origen, St. Hippolytus, St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, St. Cornelius, and St. Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century—St. Peter of Alexandria, Eusebius of Cæsarea, St. Theodore, St. James of Nisibis, St. Hilary, St. Cyril of

PAGES

Jerusalem, St. Ephrem the Syrian, St. Gregory of Nazianzum, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Jerome, and St. John Chrysostom in the fourth century - 154—175

LECTURE XII

TESTIMONIES OF THE EARLY FATHERS TO TRANSUBSTANTIATION

Though the word 'transubstantiation' is of comparatively modern origin, the idea it expresses is not—The Fathers repeatedly assert that bread and wine *are made* and *do become* the Body and Blood of Christ—SS. Irenæus, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, the Liturgies of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Constantinople, and St. Ambrose, the Syriac Liturgy, Liturgy of St. Gregory, and the Ethiopian Liturgy, all testify to *change* of substance—St. Cyril of Jerusalem—Waterworth on this passage of St. Cyril's—St. Ambrose—The Fathers declare the bread *passes into*, or is *converted into*, the Body of Christ—St. Gregory of Nyssa—St. Chrysostom—A word peculiar to St. John Chrysostom—The Latin equivalent of this word by St. Ambrose—Transelemental—St. Cyril of Alexandria's use of this word and St. Gregory of Nyssa's—Another word used by St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Ambrose—The Primitive Church emphatically held and clearly taught Transubstantiation - - 176—188

LECTURE XIII

TWO EARLY FATHERS ON THE EUCHARIST

An objection which might be urged against the previous choice of passages—St. Ambrose on the 'Mysteries of the Christian Religion'—A pamphlet by St. Cyril of Jerusalem—These two Fathers speak for the East and the West - - - - - - - 189—20

LECTURE XIV

CORPUS CHRISTI

What the Feast is—The Jewish manna and the Christian Manna—The state of abasement to which God has reduced Himself in the Blessed Sacrament—In the

PAGES

Eucharist He is more hidden than in the Incarnation—The miracle of Transubstantiation is different from all the other miracles of our Lord—The Blessed Sacrament is the crowning effect of God's love—The nearness of God to man under the Christian dispensation—A Corpus Christi procession - - - - - 202—217

LECTURE XV

THE SACRAMENT OF LOVE

Man and his nature—His insatiable craving for the infinite —*Vanitas vanitatum*—To strive for the possession of God is a law of man's nature—Why should God love man?—Four essential conditions of true love—A crowning mystery—Three great steps in the love of God for man —The Holy Eucharist is the Incarnation perpetually present—Do we bear in mind the wonderful love of God when receiving Him in Holy Communion?—What the sacred Host conceals—'He loved *me*'—Reparation, faith, and love - - - - - 218—232

LECTURE XVI

THE FOUR MANIFESTATIONS OF GOD IN MAN

Three of these manifestations are already accomplished—The fourth, for us, is yet to come—(i.) Creation—(ii.) The Incarnation—(iii.) The Holy Eucharist—(iv.) The Beatific Vision - - - - - - 233—248

LECTURES ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST

LECTURE I

THE OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES OF THE MASS

By the Bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, Christ once for all redeemed mankind from sin and hell. But those infinite merits which Christ won on Calvary He did not at once apply to the soul of each individual human being. Had He done so, Baptism would not have been necessary for salvation. No, on Calvary Christ stored up an infinite cistern, as it were, of merits; but the waters of that cistern each man, to be saved, must have laid on to his own soul. For Christ, who redeemed you without your willing it, will not save you without your willing it.

How, then, are Christ's infinite merits brought to the door of each man's heart?

In many ways. For instance, by prayer, by almsgiving, by Baptism and the other Sacraments. But one conspicuous way is by the Sacrament of the Eucharist, by the reception into your soul of the

Body and Blood of Christ. This doctrinal fact we shall emphasize and prove in a subsequent lecture. For the present it is enough to have affirmed and called attention to it.

But the Holy Eucharist is consecrated during Holy Mass. The Sacrifice of the Mass precedes the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The Sacrifice of the Mass is the central rite of the Christian religion.

Yes, the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Catholic Mass —the continuation and perpetuation of the Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross—has taken the place of that central rite of the Mosaic religion, the bloody sacrifices of the Jews. The Jews themselves bear witness to that fact.

Consequently, as the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrament of the Eucharist which follows from the Sacrifice of the Mass, are of such transcendent importance, it is not unreasonable to ask whether or not the Sacrifice of the Mass was foreshadowed in the Old Dispensation.

Turn, then, to the Old Testament, and let us inquire whether the Mass was in any way foretold to the Jews.

If it was not so foretold, that silence would not tell against the Mass. From that silence we could only argue that God had not thought fit to utter the prophecy. But if the Mass was foretold, we have a cogent argument for the Sacrament of the Eucharist and for the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Let us, therefore, state the question clearly: Was there, under the Old Testament, any prophecy given

to the Jews—and through the Jews to the whole world—of the future Sacrifice of the Mass?

That question we now proceed to answer.

(A) The Order of Melchisedech.

In the Old Testament there is an assertion made concerning the priesthood of the Messias which affords clear evidence on the subject we are discussing; for the Messias is there called 'a priest according to the order of Melchisedech.' What does this mean?

We will first give the Scripture passages, and then we will draw our inferences from them.

Melchisedech, King of Salem and priest of the Most High God, met Abram in the Valley of Shareh, and brought out bread and wine and blessed Abram, and received tithes from him. This Canaanite, in a mysterious fashion, crosses for a moment the path of Abram, and is unhesitatingly recognised as a person of higher spiritual rank than the patriarch himself.[1] Suddenly he appeared, and as suddenly he disappeared, to be lost to the Sacred Writings for a thousand years. As Balaam was a prophet, so Melchisedech was a priest, among the corrupted heathens; not self-appointed, but constituted by a special gift from God, and recognised as such by God. Thus the Scripture narrative runs (Gen. xiv. 18-20):

'Melchisedech, the King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most

[1] Referring to this fact, St. Paul (Heb. vii. 7) writes: 'Without all contradiction, that which is less is blessed by the better.'

High God, blessed him [Abram], and said: Blessed be Abram by the Most High God, who created heaven and earth. And blessed be the Most High God, by whose protection the enemies are in thy hands. And he [Abram] gave him [Melchisedech] the tithes of all.'

Next, the Old Testament gives us the relation between Melchisedech, the type, and the future Messias, the antitype. For (Ps. cix. 4) the future Messias is described as a priest after the fashion of Melchisedech:

'The Lord hath sworn, and He will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech.'

Thirdly, St. Paul (Heb. v.-vii.) quotes these two passages, endorses them, develops at great length the doctrine which they embody, and draws out the typical relation of Melchisedech to Jesus of Nazareth:

'Christ . . . the Son of God . . . the cause of eternal salvation [was] called by God a High Priest according to the order of Melchisedech' (Heb. v. 10).

Now, the office of a priest is to offer sacrifice. *Cf.* Heb. v. 1: 'For every high priest taken from among men is ordained . . . that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins.' Without a priesthood there can be no sacrifice; without sacrifice there can be no priesthood. Priesthood is the correlative of sacrifice, as sacrifice is the correlative of priesthood.

Again, a priest belongs to this or that 'order,' according as his office is to offer this or that kind of

sacrifice. Now, Christ was declared to be of 'the order of Melchisedech.' Why? Because Christ would offer the same kind of sacrifice as Melchisedech. Melchisedech, high priest before the Old Law, was the type; Christ, High Priest before the New Law, was the realization of that type. Melchisedech was the shadow; Christ was the substance. What, then, was the point of resemblance, the analogy, between Melchisedech the appearance and Christ the reality? In other words, what kind of sacrifice did Melchisedech on the one hand, and Christ on the other, offer? The answer is plain. Melchisedech offered sacrifice of bread and wine (Gen. xiv. 18). And Melchisedech alone, in the Old Testament, offered, as the distinguishing rite of his priesthood, bread and wine. Therefore, when Christ was proclaimed to be a Priest of the order of Melchisedech, it was thereby foretold, twenty centuries before the event, that He, too, would offer sacrifice of bread and wine as the distinguishing rite of His priesthood. But Melchisedech was only the type, and therefore his sacrifice was of mere bread and mere wine. But Christ was the accomplishment of that type, and therefore He offered sacrifice of bread indeed, but of bread consecrated into His own Body; and of wine indeed, but of wine consecrated into His own Blood.

Consequently the sacrifice of Melchisedech prefigured the Sacrifice of the Mass.

A superficial reader of Holy Writ might object that Christ's Sacrifice was the Bloody Sacrifice of Himself on the Cross, and therefore that He was a Priest of the order of Aaron—for the Jewish priests

offered sacrifices of blood—and not of Melchisedech. Think out the answer to this difficulty, and you will find that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament; and that Christ, the Great High Priest, sacrificed, not only on the Cross, but also at the Last Supper. Thus the Sacrifice of the Eucharist preceded in time the Sacrifice of the Cross. The Unbloody Sacrifice of Bread and Wine preceded in time the Bloody Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood. For both David and St. Paul—the 109th Psalm as well as the Epistle to the Hebrews—call Christ a Priest according to the order, not of Aaron, but of Melchisedech. Now, Christ was not such on the Cross; for on the Cross He offered a Bloody Sacrifice which was according to the order rather of Aaron than of Melchisedech. Consequently He became a Priest after the fashion of Melchisedech only at the Last Supper, when—like Melchisedech, under the forms of bread and wine—He offered the Eucharist to God.

(B) The Prophecy of Malachi.

Another utterance of the Old Testament, with reference to the future Sacrifice of the Mass, is contained in the famous prophecy of Malachi. Malachi wrote about four and a half centuries before Christ. He was the last of the prophets, and therefore the last message to the world which God intrusted to the long roll of His prophets was the prediction of Holy Mass and of the Holy Eucharist.

The Jewish priests, the descendants of Aaron, the members of the sacerdotal tribe of Levi, had insulted

God by the careless way in which they had offered sacrifice, by their negligence, their irreligion, and their unbelief. Therefore God foretold, 450 years before the event, that they and their office should pass away—that the Jewish priesthood and the Jewish sacrifices should be abolished. A new order of priests should supplant the old; and the Bloodless Sacrifice of the New Law should take the place of the bloody sacrifices of the old.

Thus the prophecy ran (Mal. i. 7, 11):

'O priests that despise My Name! . . . Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar. And ye offer in sacrifice blind and lame and sick victims. . . . I have no pleasure in you; neither will I accept an offering at your hand.

'For, from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My Name is great among the Gentiles. And in every place there is sacrifice. And there is offered to My Name a clean oblation. For My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Armies.'

I

In this great prophecy God's reprimand is directed, not against the Jewish people, but wholly and solely against the Jewish priests. The words are: 'Ye, O priests, that despise My Name.' And how had they despised God's Name? By holding the altar, or table, of the Lord to be contemptible. Again, the words are: 'You say the table of the Lord is contemptible' (i. 7). But how had they said this? By offering in sacrifice mere rubbish, worthless victims.

Their law required that they should offer in sacrifice only perfect victims, 'victims without blemish' (Lev. xxii. 17-25). Yet they had, in their folly, presumed to offer in sacrifice rotten bread and blemished victims:

'Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar. . . . Ye offer the blind for sacrifice . . . and the lame and the sick' (i. 8).

What these Jewish priests would not have dared to offer to a human king, they had had the arrogance to offer to Jehovah, the King of kings! Thus did God upbraid them:

'Offer these things to thy prince, and see if he will be pleased with them, and see whether he will look smilingly upon thee!' (i. 8).

God's reprimand, it is clear, concerns the Divine liturgy and the external rite of sacrifice. Consequently God's remedy for these evils concerns the Divine liturgy and the external rite of sacrifice.

Hence the Divine prophecy contains a threat and a promise.

The threat is the abolition of the Jewish priesthood, and therefore of the Jewish sacrifices. The words are clear:

'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, and I will not receive a gift at your hand' (i. 10).

The promise is the foretelling of another priesthood and another sacrifice to take the place of the priesthood and the sacrifices abolished. Again the words are clear:

'For, from the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof, My Name is great among the Gentiles.

And in every place there is sacrifice. And there is offered to My Name a clean oblation. For My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Armies.'

Therefore, the prophecy tells us, sacrifice to God was, in the distant future, no longer to be confined —as for centuries it had been confined—to the Jews. It was to include all the nations of the earth, 'from the rising of the sun even until the going down of the same.' It was to include all the Gentiles—that is, the non-Jews:

'My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Armies, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles' (i. 11).

In that then distant future, sacrifice to God was no longer to be confined to Jerusalem; it was to embrace the whole earth. Thus the prediction runs: 'In every place there shall be sacrifice' (i. 11).

Hitherto the Temple of God and the sacrifices to God, had been confined to Jerusalem. But the Christian Sacrifice was to cover the earth. So said Christ Himself to the woman of Sichar in Samaria, as He sat by Jacob's well. She had said to him: 'Sir, our fathers adored [that is, sacrificed] on this mountain. But you say that at Jerusalem is the place where men must adore' [that is, sacrifice].

Yes, the Samaritans had had a temple of their own on Mount Gerizim, but they were schismatical, and their sacrifices invalid.

But now Christ answered:

'Woman, believe Me that the hour cometh'—that

hour foretold by Malachi—'when you shall adore'—that is, sacrifice—'not merely on this mountain, not merely in Jerusalem, but wherever God exists'—that is, in the whole wide world (John iv. 20). That 'adore' means 'sacrifice' is clear. For certainly 'adoration' of God was never restricted to Jerusalem. I have somewhat paraphrased the Gospel words in order to draw out the sense. Christ said that 'true adorers should adore in spirit and in truth.' *In spirit—i.e.*, not with merely external worship, and not merely in one particular place; for God is a Spirit and is everywhere. *In truth—i.e.*, in the reality, and not merely in figure and in shadow.

Hence it is clear that the words addressed by Malachi to the Jewish priests, 'An offering at your hand I will not receive,' when compared with the universality of the new worship to come, implied the abolition of the sacrifices of the Old Law and the substitution of the Sacrifice of the New Law.

II

Again, we may note, it was not the internal worship of mind and of heart that God meant to do away with among the Jews. No, the sacrifices abolished were external sacrifices; and only in so far as they were external do the prophetic words apply to them. Now, the new Sacrifice to be instituted was to be the counterpart of, and the substitute for, the old sacrifices abolished. Therefore, the new Sacrifice to be instituted was also to be

external sacrifice. The words of the prophecy to this effect are quite clear: 'In every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a clean oblation.'

Moreover, the words here used in the original Hebrew are never employed to signify any worship except external worship. Nor are they ever used of an external worship which is not connected with real sacrifice. Not only so. The word which we translate 'offering' is in Hebrew *minchah*, which always means, not only 'sacrifice,' but an '*unbloody* sacrifice.' The prophet, then, uses only sacrificial words, and sacrificial words that signify, not a bloody, but a bloodless sacrifice. Consequently, it cannot be objected that he is referring to the Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross. Furthermore, the Sacrifice which Malachi foretells is to be a Sacrifice 'in every place,' and the Sacrifice of the Cross was only in one place—Calvary. The prophet foretells that the bloody sacrifices—of bulls and goats and rams, etc.—which were offered but in one place, the Temple of Jerusalem, shall be superseded by the Bloodless Sacrifice of the New Law, which shall be offered in every place.

It is obvious, therefore, that the prophesied worship of the future—*i.e.*, the Christian future—was to be sacrifice real, external, bloodless.

Let me restate and emphasize this.

The prophesied Christian worship was to be a real and external Sacrifice: firstly, because of the antithesis between the Jewish sacrifices abolished and the new 'oblation' substituted; secondly, because of the

words designedly used by Malachi—words which mean real and external sacrifice, and mean nothing else.

Thirdly, the new Sacrifice was to be a Bloodless Sacrifice, because the word carefully chosen by Malachi—*minchah*—means 'Bloodless Sacrifice,' and means nothing else.

III

With the abolition of the Jewish sacrifices, the Jewish priesthood was, of course, abolished; for the word 'priest' connotes 'sacrifice.' There can no more be a priest without sacrifice than there can be a husband without a wife or a mother without a child. Therefore the abolition of the Jewish sacrifices carried with it the abolition of the Jewish priesthood. So ran the words of God:

'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, and a gift at your hand I will not receive' (i. 10).

And so St. Paul (Heb. vii. 11, 12) tells us that with a translation of the Law 'the priesthood was translated,' that the 'Levitical priesthood' was abolished, and that 'the order of Aaron' gave place to 'the order of Melchisedech.' Therefore, with the abolition of the priesthood of the Old Dispensation, there was established at the same time a priesthood of the New Dispensation—a priesthood that should sacrifice, not merely in Jerusalem, but throughout the world; a priesthood that should offer to the Lord, not the bloody sacrifice of 'bulls and goats

and calves' (Heb. ix. 11, 12), but a 'clean oblation.' Thus spoke the prophet (iii. 3):

'The Lord shall purify the sons of Levi, and refine them as gold and as silver; and they shall offer sacrifices to the Lord in justice.'

'Sons of Levi' is the title by which the prophet designates the priests of the New Dispensation; not that he meant the Levites of the Old Law, for their 'order' had been abolished, but because he is addressing Jews, and to a Jew a 'son of Levi' was a synonym for 'priest.'

The prophecy of Malachi, therefore, not only foretold the future abolition of the bloody sacrifices of the Jews, offered only in Jerusalem, and the future abolition of the Jewish priesthood which performed those sacrifices; it foretold also the future institution of an Unbloody Sacrifice, to be offered throughout the world, and the future institution of a new priesthood to perform that Sacrifice.

IV

Let us now sum up the five characteristic marks, or notes, which, according to the prophet Malachi, distinguish the Sacrifice of the New Law from the abolished sacrifices of the Old Law.

(i.) *Catholicity.*

The first note is that of catholicity, or universality. The Sacrifice of the New Law was not to be the exclusive possession of one nation—the Jews; nor

was it to be restricted to one city—Jerusalem. But it was to be the heritage of all nations:

'From the rising of the sun, even to the going down thereof, My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

And it was to be offered in all places:

'In every place there is sacrifice.'

(ii.) *The Universal Priesthood.*

The second note of the Sacrifice of the New Law is that of a universal priesthood. The priests of the Old Law had been drawn wholly and solely from one nation—the Jews—and wholly and solely from one tribe within that nation—the tribe of Levi. Hence the claim of the Jewish priests to sacerdotal power was based on nationality, birth, and blood.

Not so with the priesthood of the New Law. That was to be of all nations, and of all races, and of all lands, without destinction of name, or blood, or colour. Its propagation was to be, not by carnal union, but by spiritual generation. That is, by episcopal consecration. 'For the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation also be made of the Law' (Heb. vii. 12).

(iii.) *The Form of the Sacrifice.*

The third note of the Sacrifice of the New Law is the form of that Sacrifice. It was to be a 'clean oblation,' a Bloodless Sacrifice.

So long as the sins of mankind remained unexpiated, the sacrifices for sin were bloody sacrifices,

and the altars of God were very shambles that ran red with the blood of victims. But when the sins of humanity had been redeemed by Christ, in His Bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, sacrifices of blood were for ever abolished, and the sacrificing priest was called upon no more to watch the quiverings of pitiable death.

And why was this? Because the bloody sacrifices of the Old Law were but types of the Bloody Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; so that when the reality came the type was abolished. And for this reason also, that this change in the manner of sacrifice might indicate the change in man's moral state: the change from the state of the unredeemed to that of the redeemed—redeemed once and for ever by the Blood of Christ Jesus our Lord.

Therefore the Sacrifice of the New Law was to respond to the sacrificial type which had foreshadowed it. And that sacrificial type, as we saw in the case of Melchisedech, was the oblation of bread and wine. The Sacrifice of the New Law, the prophet Malachi foretold, should be a *minchah*, a clean oblation.

Thus was the order of the priesthood of Aaron 'translated' into the order of the priesthood of Melchisedech.

(iv.) *Intrinsic Excellence.*

The fourth note of the Sacrifice of the New Law was to be 'cleanliness'—that is, intrinsic excellence. The Christian Sacrifice of the Mass is called by Malachi 'a clean oblation.' Now, that mark of

'cleanliness,' does it belong to the priest who sacrifices, or to the offering of which he makes sacrifice?

Not to the priest who sacrifices—at least, not primarily, not principally. For the priest is ever a man, with the weak and sinful nature of man, and it is unlikely that amid the great army of Christian priests all should ever be found with hearts pure and with consciences clean.

Therefore the moral cleanliness foretold by Malachi must refer, not to the priest who sacrifices, but to the Victim sacrificed. The sacrifices of the Old Law depended, at least in part, for their value on the character of the priest who offered them, and were 'polluted' by the polluted hands of a sinful priest. And therefore Malachi wrote (ii. 1):

'O ye priests . . . if ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory to My Name, saith the Lord of Hosts, I will curse your blessings; yea, I will curse them, because ye have not laid it to heart.'

But the Victim of the Christian Sacrifice is to be ever, *by its own nature*, a pure offering, a clean oblation, always for its own sake acceptable to God.

(v.) *Glory given to God.*

The fifth and last note of the Sacrifice of the New Law is that of glory given to God in every place and among every nation:

'From the rising of the sun even to the going down thereof, My Name is great among the Gentiles. And in every place there is sacrifice. And there is offered to My Name a clean oblation. For My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

V

The Fulfilment

And now let us ask two questions:

First, Where has the prophecy of Malachi not been fulfilled?

Secondly, Where has it been fulfilled?

To the first question I answer:

Not in the Jewish sacrifices. For the Jewish sacrifices have been abolished by God.

Not in the pagan sacrifices. For, as St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. x. 20), the gods of the pagans are devils.

Not in the Protestant worship. For the Protestant worship has neither priest nor sacrifice.

Where, then, has Malachi's prophecy been verified? To this second question the answer is as easy as to the first:

The Sacrifice of the New Law was to be under the form of bread and wine. The Sacrifice of the Mass is under the form of bread and wine.

The Sacrifice of the New Law was to be a 'clean oblation,' the value of which was the value of the Victim sacrificed, and not the moral worth of the priest sacrificing. The Sacrifice of the Mass is such a 'clean oblation,' for the Victim therein is of infinite value, Christ Jesus our Lord!

The Sacrifice of the New Law was to have priests of every nation, race, and colour. The Sacrifice of the Mass has priests of every nation, race, and colour.

The Sacrifice of the New Law was to be 'in every place.' The Sacrifice of the Mass is in every place.

The Sacrifice of the New Law was to be 'among the Gentiles'—that is, among all nations 'from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same.' That, most assuredly, is verified in the case of Holy Mass. There is not a single second in the twenty-four hours in which Mass is not being celebrated in some part of the world.

Therefore these great prophecies of the Old Law are realized in the Catholic Mass, and they are realized in the Catholic Mass alone. The Mass was begun by Christ, and it has gone on ever since. You cannot mention any period in Christian history when the Mass came in as an innovation. It was celebrated by Christ at the Last Supper. It was celebrated by the Apostles. It was celebrated by the early Christians. It was celebrated in the Middle Ages. It is being celebrated now. And it will be celebrated, always, everywhere, till the end of time. Hence, if the prophecy of Malachi has been fulfilled at all, it has been fulfilled in the Catholic Mass, and only in the Catholic Mass. If it has not been fulfilled in the Catholic Mass, it has not been fulfilled at all.

LECTURE II

CHRIST'S PROMISE OF THE EUCHARIST—I

We have seen already that in the Old Testament the Sacrifice of the Mass, and therefore the Sacrament of the Eucharist, were distinctly promised by God to the whole world. We now go on to study the fulfilment of that promise in the New Law.

Forty days after Christ rose again from the dead He ascended from Mount Olivet into heaven, where for ever He sits at the right hand of the Father.

But Christ not only ascended into heaven; He also remained upon earth. Ever since that visible departure from among men He has also tarried with invisible presence in the midst of men. In the tabernacle of every Catholic Church Jesus Christ is bodily present. During the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass the priest utters the solemn words of consecration, first over the bread, and then over the wine; and by those words of power a stupendous change is wrought. For the appearances of bread remain, and the appearances of wine remain; but the whole substance of the bread is converted into Christ's Body, and the whole substance of the wine is converted into Christ's Blood.

Yes, in the Holy Eucharist, under the accidents of bread and under the accidents of wine, there is present—truly, really, and substantially—the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, God and Man, the Son of Mary, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.

The dogma of the Holy Eucharist focusses and sums up the most fundamental doctrines of Christianity—the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Divine Maternity of Mary.

Moreover, it is the defined and dogmatic teaching of the Church, formulated by Pope Pius VI. in the Bull *Auctorem Fidei*, that in the Holy Eucharist, not only is the *fact* of Christ's presence a matter of Divine and Catholic faith, but also the *mode* of that presence. And this mode itself comprises two matters of faith.

Therefore in the doctrine of the Real Presence there are three distinct points which are of faith:

First, that Christ is truly, really, and substantially present under the accidents of bread and wine.

Secondly, that the substances of the bread and wine are no longer there, but only the accidents of bread and wine.

Thirdly, that the presence of Christ and the absence of the substances of bread and wine are effected by transubstantiation—that is, by the conversion of the whole of the substance of bread into the Body, and the whole of the substance of wine into the Blood, of Christ.

Now, to-day we are going to deal only with the *fact* of Christ's presence.

The *mode*, or manner, of that presence we leave for future consideration.

In the present discourse we undertake the proof of this one point—that in the Blessed Sacrament Christ is truly, really, and substantially present.

Again, in the discussion of the *fact* of the Real Presence two distinct questions present themselves for solution :

First, is the Real Presence possible ?

Secondly, if possible, is it a fact of which there is evidence ?

But to these two questions we reply with one answer—an all-sufficient answer—namely, that the Real Presence is a demonstrated fact. This one reply is, we affirm, a full answer to both questions ; for though a thing may be possible without being a fact, yet it cannot be a fact without being possible. So that to prove the fact is thereby to prove the possibility of the fact.

This, then, is our reply to both questions, that the Real Presence is a fact, and thus is possible. For the Bible clearly teaches the Real Presence, and as the Bible is the Word of God, and as God can neither deceive nor be deceived, to doubt the possibility of the Real Presence would be to doubt either God's veracity, or His knowledge, or His power, or all three. We have God's word for the fact, and therefore we have God's word for the possibility of that fact. Consequently, to the objection, for ever being repeated, that the Real Presence is an

impossibility, and therefore cannot be a fact, we retort that the Real Presence is a fact, and therefore cannot be an impossibility.

The whole point, therefore, for our study resolves itself into this: 'Is there evidence for the fact of the Real Presence?'

Yes, we reply, the evidence for it is overwhelming.

But to-day let us confine ourselves to one item of this evidence—Christ's promise of the Real Presence, as recorded in the Bible.

Therefore we lay down this proposition, that our Lord, in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, clearly, emphatically, and repeatedly, promised to institute the Real Presence.

To the proof of this assertion we now invite your close attention.

I

To prepare the minds of the Jews for the idea of the Real Presence, Christ worked the great miracle set forth in the earlier part of this same sixth chapter of St. John.

Five thousand men had followed our Lord into the desert to listen to His teaching, and after days of fasting they were famishing with hunger. Then Jesus took five loaves, and blessed them, and distributed them to the multitude. And the multitude ate, and were filled, and the fragments over and above amounted to more than twelve baskets full.

Now, mark! Christ did not multiply the number of the loaves. He did not increase the five into five thousand loaves. Apparently the loaves never ex-

ceeded five. Each of the five thousand men ate of some one of those five loaves. And the twelve baskets of fragments were fragments of the same five loaves. As in the Eucharist the same living Body of Christ is at one and the same time on countless altars, so those same five loaves were at one and the same time in the hands of those five thousand men.

The multiplication of the loaves in that miracle was a striking type of the multilocation of Christ's Body in the Blessed Sacrament.

Moreover, as narrated later in this same chapter of St. John which is engaging our attention, to convince the Jews of His power over matter, and of His ability to institute the Real Presence, Christ on the evening of that same day worked another prodigy. He walked on the Sea of Galilee. By His multiplication of the bread He had manifested His power over solid matter. By His walking on the waters He manifested His power over liquid matter. It came about thus:

After the miracle of the loaves the great Wonder-Worker went up into the mountain to pray. Then His Apostles took ship and set out up the Sea of Galilee for Capharnaum. But when they had made only some four miles from land the darkness came on, a storm arose, the sea grew white with foaming billows, and the disciples were filled with terror. Then, on a sudden, on the tumbling surface of that angry water they saw Christ calmly walking, and a superstitious dread took possession of them. But Jesus said:

'It is I! Be not afraid.'

And forthwith, they knew not how, the ship was at Capharnaum.

In face of these two miracles he is a bold man who shall undertake to limit God's power over matter and to say to the Omnipotent, 'Thus far shalt Thou go, but no further.'

II

A short time after that Christ entered into the synagogue of Capharnaum,[1] and began to teach the Jews the doctrine of the Real Presence.

He promised that, as in the multiplication of the loaves He had given them food that perisheth, so in the future He would, in His Flesh and Blood, give them a meat which should endure unto life everlasting. In the clearest terms He promised that His Body should become the meat, and that His Blood should become the drink, of the world.

[1] This is, perhaps, the synagogue built for the Jews by the Roman centurion of whom we are told in John vi. 25-28.

We read in Edersheim ('Jewish Social Life,' chap. xvi., p. 257) that 'the very lintel of this synagogue has been found, and the device upon it bears such close reference to the question which the Jews put to Jesus that we can almost imagine them pointing up to it as they entered the synagogue and said: "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat" (John vi. 31). . . . For the lintel lying among the ruins of the good centurion's synagogue at Capharnaum has carved on it the device of a pot of manna. What is further remarkable, this lintel is ornamented besides with a flowing pattern of vine-leaves and clusters of grapes, another emblem of the mystery of which our Lord discoursed so largely in this synagogue.'

Thus He prepared them for their first Communion.

Listen to His words. Plainer words none could utter. Go out of your way to pick the simplest language to express the Catholic dogma of the Real Presence, and language simpler than that actually used by Christ you shall not find:

'I am the Bread of Life. . . . '

'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it he may not die.'

'I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven.'

'If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever.'

'The Bread that I will give is My Flesh.'

The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying: 'How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?'

And Jesus made answer:

'Amen, amen, I say to you, unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His Blood, you shall not have life in you.'

'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.'

'For My Flesh is true meat and My Blood is true drink.'

'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood abideth in Me, and I in him.'

'As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me the same shall live by Me.'

'This is the Bread that came down from heaven. He that eateth this Bread shall live for ever' (John vi. 48-59).

III

But, it is objected, Christ's language is here not literal, but only metaphorical. For the words, 'Eat My Flesh and drink My Blood,' imply nothing more than Faith in Christ's Passion. Just as when Christ said, 'I am the Door,' and just as when He said, 'I am the Vine,' so also when He said, 'My Flesh is meat in very truth, and My Blood is drink in very truth,' He was using language merely figurative.

Such is the objection. Is it valid or invalid?

If valid, then from this sixth chapter of St. John the Real Presence cannot be proved.

If invalid, then from this sixth chapter alone the Real Presence is demonstrated.

If this objection is valid, the doctrine of the Real Presence *may* be false. But if this objection is invalid, every religion which denies the Real Presence *must* be false.

This, then, is the momentous question for our consideration: Do these words of Christ mean what they say, or do they mean something entirely different?

Are Christ's words, above quoted, literal or metaphorical?

For nineteen centuries the Church has answered 'literal'; and surely her judgment is more trustworthy than that of opponents who combine to find

in the words a metaphor, though what that metaphor may be scarce two of them can agree.

That Christ sometimes used metaphors, we allow. That He always used metaphors when His words do not square with everyday experiences, we deny.

We freely grant that when our Lord likened Himself to a 'Door' and to a 'Vine' He uttered an obvious metaphor, which was instantly understood as such. No one ever said, 'This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?' No one ever asked, 'How can this man be a Door?' No one ever inquired, 'How can this man be a Vine?'

But while, on the one hand, none ever dreamt of taking literally 'I am the Door' or 'I am the Vine,' so, on the other hand, no true believer in the Incarnation ever dreamt of taking metaphorically 'My Flesh is true meat, and My Blood is true drink,' until the heresiarch Berengarius in the eleventh century, and even he recanted. The plain meaning of the Door passage and the Vine passage is metaphorical; the plain meaning of the Flesh-and-Blood passage is literal.

The whole of this objection is, moreover, refuted by a single word of the sacred text—the word 'Bread.'

'Bread,' it is objected, means 'faith in Christ.' Present faith, we ask, or future faith? Was 'faith in Christ' to be 'Bread' for the souls of those Jews of Capharnaum, then, when our Lord spoke to them, or only at some future time?

Then, when our Lord spoke, as is plain.

Yet our Lord does not say, the 'Bread which I

have given,' He does not say, the 'Bread which I now give,' but the 'Bread which I *will* give—is My Flesh.'

Consequently, if He is referring to the future institution of the Blessed Sacrament, this future tense is quite clear; but if He is referring to present faith in Himself, this future tense has no meaning.

But, it is further objected, Christ must have intended a metaphor, because in the 64th verse [in the Anglican Version it is the 63rd verse] He said:

'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.'

On the contrary, I reply, this is the only place in the whole chapter where 'flesh' is used metaphorically. Moreover, in this verse (63rd) the word is just as obviously metaphorical, as in the passages quoted above it is obviously figurative. Let me explain.

Every student of the Bible knows that when 'flesh' is put in opposition to 'spirit' both are metaphorical. Take two instances:

'Watch ye and pray that ye enter not into temptation. The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh weak' (Matt. xxvi. 41).

'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, but that which is born of the spirit is spirit' (John iii. 6).

Whenever 'flesh' is put in contrast with 'spirit' the former signifies a natural element, the latter a supernatural element.

Therefore in this 64th verse, on which the objection we are discussing is based, our Lord obviously means

this—that the merely material element in Him, His natural flesh alone — apart from the supernatural element, His Divinity — profiteth nothing. The Jews falsely believed Him to be a mere man, and He assures them that the flesh of a mere man can profit nothing.

Christ is one Person, and that Person Divine; but He has two natures—one human and the other Divine. He is both man and God; and 'that which quickeneth,' or giveth life, is His Flesh and His Blood, His living Body, not as a material human body, but as united substantially with His Divinity.

The verse in question, therefore, affords no shadow of an objection to the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Nay, more. So far from this verse being a stumbling-block, it actually proves the Real Presence:

'The words that I speak to you are spirit and life.'

What words?

The words, 'My Flesh and My Blood.'

That is, My Flesh and My Blood are to you the vivifying spirit, or principle, of your supernatural life!

Such is the interpretation, not only of Catholic, but also of Protestant, scholars. For instance, of the Protestant commentator, Dean Alford, in his edition of the Greek New Testament and in his discussion of this passage.

However, if there be any opponent whom this explanation does not satisfy, I should like to ask him these seven following questions:

First, our Lord did not say '*My* Flesh,' but '*the* Flesh profiteth nothing.' Why '*the*,' and not '*My*'?

Secondly, if by '*the* Flesh' Christ had meant '*My* Flesh,' would He not have uttered a flat contradiction of His own previous words—viz., 'He that eateth *My* Flesh hath everlasting life'?

Thirdly, if our Lord meant that His real Flesh profiteth nothing, why did He not also add that His Blood profiteth nothing? And yet He here makes no mention of His Blood, though He had just assured us that, 'unless ye drink the Blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you'! (verse 53).

Fourthly, how could our Lord possibly say that *His* Flesh and Blood profit nothing, when by His Flesh and Blood He was about to redeem the world?

Fifthly, if in this verse '*the* Flesh' means 'Christ's Flesh,' must not 'the spirit' mean 'Christ's Spirit'? and does not that turn the verse into nonsense?

Sixthly, if 'the Flesh' means 'Christ's Flesh,' and if Christ's Flesh profiteth nothing, how can Christ's Flesh mean—as opponents say that it does mean—faith in Christ? Does faith in Christ profit nothing?

Seventhly, and lastly, if this 64th verse turns all Christ's teaching about the Eucharist into a mere metaphor, why did the Jews refuse to walk (verse 67) any more with Christ? and why did Christ without a word let them depart, and depart unto eternal damnation? For the Master Himself had just assured them—the echo of His words was yet in their ears:

'Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man and drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you' (verse 54).

LECTURE III

CHRIST'S PROMISE OF THE EUCHARIST—II

We proved last time that in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel our Blessed Lord clearly and repeatedly promised the future boon of the Blessed Sacrament.

Moreover, we stated and refuted the objection that Christ's language was not literal, but only figurative.

But let us to-day give a fuller hearing to the opponent's argument against the Catholic teaching. Let us examine more closely his contention that the eating of Christ's Flesh and the drinking of Christ's Blood is but a metaphor.

I

We begin, therefore, by proposing this question: Did this expression, 'to eat a man's flesh and to drink a man's blood,' ever bear a figurative meaning among the Jews?

We confess that it did. As a metaphor it was current among them. Then we ask further:

Must Catholics, in consequence, admit that there lies a choice between a literal and a figurative interpretation of our Lord's words?

They must.

We have next to ask: Did this expression bear one metaphorical meaning only, or more than one?

We reply that it bore one only. It figuratively meant this, and it meant this only: to injure a man, mostly by calumny. A few instances will make this clear:

St. Paul (Gal. v. 15), writing of the uncharitable, says:

'If you bite and *eat* one another'—*i.e.*, calumniate one another.

The Psalmist (xxvi. 2) says:

'The wicked draw nigh against me *to eat my flesh*'—*i.e.*, to injure and calumniate me.

Holy Job (xix. 22) says:

'Why do you *glut yourselves with my flesh?*'—*i.e.*, calumniate me.

The Prophet Micheas (iii. 3) says:

'Ye who have *eaten the flesh of my people*'—*i.e.*, calumniated them.

Opponents may now take their choice between the one literal and the one metaphorical meaning of Christ's words. If interpreted literally, those words obviously express the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, the eating of Christ's Flesh and the drinking of Christ's Blood. If interpreted metaphorically, those words can only mean this: 'He that doth calumniate Me hath everlasting life.'

The literal meaning seems preferable.

This choice of meanings is in reality no choice at all. The words in their literal sense are plain. In their metaphorical sense they are nonsense.

II

Again, the inspired writers must have understood the right meaning of the expression, 'eating Christ's Flesh and drinking Christ's Blood.' Do they explain it as a metaphor? Never. The question is treated by St. John, yet no hint of a metaphor; by St. Luke, no hint of a metaphor; by St. Matthew and St. Mark, no hint of a metaphor; by St. Paul, who, so far from toning down the eating of Christ's Flesh and the drinking of Christ's Blood into a metaphor, thunders out a sentence of eternal damnation against him who dares to eat it and drink it unworthily.

III

Moreover, when our Lord used metaphorical language which His hearers understood literally, His custom was to explain his own meaning and to point out their mistake. Take two examples.

When He said to Nicodemus (John iii. 3): 'Unless a man be born again, he cannot see God'; and Nicodemus, understanding Him literally, asked, 'How can a man be born again when he is old?' Christ at once explained the metaphor: 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost,' etc.

On another occasion, when sitting by Jacob's well at Sichar in Samaria (John iv. 34), Christ said to His disciples, 'I have a meat to eat which you know not of,' and they, taking Him literally, asked, 'Hath any man brought Him to eat?' our Lord explained His own meaning and their mistake. He

said: 'My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me.'

As often, then, as Christ's metaphorical language was understood literally, He at once hastened to explain.

Was He understood literally in this sixth chapter of St. John? Yes, for His disciples 'strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us His Flesh to eat'? Did He then explain to them that they misunderstood Him, and that His language was metaphorical? He did not. On the contrary, He time after time reiterated His former statement. He did not; and this is all the more remarkable, because the eating of human flesh and the drinking of human blood was more than horrible to a Jew. It was a sin of the deepest dye. It was a curse and a crime. In the Book of Leviticus (xvii. 10) God says: 'If any man soever eat blood, I will set My face against his soul, and I will cut him off from among his people.' It was the last and the most awful punishment which God could inflict on His enemies. For instance, in Isaias (xlix. 26) God says: 'I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh, and they shall be drunken with their own blood.'

Now, our Lord was anxious to conciliate the Jews, to deserve their confidence, to gain their esteem, to win their love. Then is it probable that He should have chosen these expressions of 'eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood' had He meant thereby only to teach, as repeatedly in the simplest language He had taught before, the necessity of faith in Himself, the Messias? Is it credible that, when grossly mis-

understood, He should have deigned no single word of explanation? If, on the one hand, Christ was only inculcating faith in Himself, He wantonly disguised a plain doctrine under images that were to the Jews unintelligible, criminal, and revolting. If, on the other hand, He was teaching the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, He chose the fittest and simplest words to convey His meaning.

IV

But more than this. Not only was our Lord wont to explain Himself when His metaphorical meaning was taken to be literal; but also, when His literal meaning was taken literally, but gave scandal and caused complaint, His custom was to stand unflinchingly by His words, to repeat them, to emphasize them. Out of many examples, let one suffice. Christ (John viii. 56) said once to the Jews:

'Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see My day; he saw it and was glad.'

The Jews understood Christ rightly, and correctly took the words in their literal sense. However, they did not believe them, but replied indignantly:

'Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham?'

Jesus at once firmly replied:

'In truth, in very truth, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.'

Now, when our Lord used the expression, 'I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven,' did His hearers understand Him literally or not?

Literally, as is obvious; for they murmured and said: 'Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How, then, saith He, I am come down from heaven?' They understood Him literally. How, then, did our Lord act? Did He explain that His words had been taken to be literal, but were meant to be metaphorical? He did not. Or did He repeat and emphasize them? He did. Nay, not only did He reiterate and insist on the words, but He went on to develop them, to unfold them, to lay bare their exact and literal meaning. They had asked how He could possibly be the 'Living Bread that had come down from heaven.' Christ answered: 'Yea, and this Bread is My Flesh' ['The Bread which I will give is My Flesh' (vi. 52)].

This was too much for the Jews. The promise seemed to them a sheer impossibility. So they strove among themselves, and said:

'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?'

This was certainly to understand Christ's words to be literal. How, then, did Christ meet this scepticism? Did He say that what He had meant to be a figure of speech they had falsely understood to be literal? Did He pare away His meaning into a metaphor? He did not; quite the contrary. Time after time He restated the unpalatable truth, amplified it, developed it; each reiteration confirming His hearers' literal interpretation of His words; each repetition driving home the literal meaning with a force and plainness which none could misunderstand.

Yes, prefacing this declaration with the grave and solemn formula which among the Jews marked a

weighty and measured statement, our Lord (verses 54 and 59), six times over, emphatically repeated the literal teaching which had given such offence. He put the literal truth in every possible light. He expressed it in the positive form; He expressed it in the negative form.

He expressed it in the positive form:

'To eat His Flesh and to drink His Blood was to win eternal life' (55).

He expressed it in the negative form:

'Not to eat His Flesh, and not to drink His Blood, was to win eternal death' (54)

Is this eating and drinking a metaphor?

No. For 'My Flesh is true meat, and My Blood is true drink' (56).

Is this the eating and drinking of Christ's merely natural Flesh and Blood?

No, it is the eating and drinking of the whole God-Man:

'He that eateth *Me*, the same shall live by Me' (58).

Said the Jews:

'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?' (53).

And from the blessed lips of Jesus came the solemn and unflinching answer:

'In truth, in full truth, I say unto you: If ye do not eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and if ye do not drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you' (54).

This language is surely clear. If it is not, we should like to inquire what clearness means.

V

To the hearers, the onlookers, the disciples of Christ—who may be supposed to have understood their own tongue—the words were clear, only too clear. For many of them left Him. They said:

'This saying is hard, and who can hear it?' (61).

This saying is hard; not hard to understand, but hard to endure—impious, revolting, abominable! And who can hear it? That is, who can listen to such utter wickedness?

Yes, the Jews understood, and rightly understood, Christ in the literal sense; and as they were a stiff-necked race and would not bend their minds to accept Christ's teaching of the Real Presence, 'they went back and walked no more with Him' (67).

Now, to any man not stony-eyed, not stony-eared, this argument clinches the matter. For if principles of reasoning signify anything; if rules of evidence have any value; then, by every principle of reasoning and by every rule of evidence, we are driven, as thinking men, to believe and maintain that Jesus of Nazareth intended to teach, and that the Jews of Capharnaum took Him to mean what His words literally implied—namely, that 'His Flesh was meat indeed, and that His Blood was drink indeed.'

Yes, Christ meant, and His hearers understood Him to mean, that He was about to give, as the food of men's souls, the Flesh and Blood of this living human body—the body born of Mary the Virgin, that same body which their own eyes saw and which their own hands handled. And as they

were an unbelieving generation, they asked: 'How can this man give us His flesh to eat?' As they were a stiff-necked race, they called His words a hard saying, unfit for decent ears—a wicked, revolting, abominable saying, not to be listened to.

Therefore they turned their backs upon Christ and left Him.

VI

And now I want to make an appeal to your common sense. And it is this:

If our Lord had intended His words to be only a metaphor, when He saw that the Jews were taking Him literally, would He, in reason, have failed to explain—could He, in conscience, have refused to undeceive them? To this great concourse of enthusiastic disciples, who just before had sought to make Him King, who just before had followed Him into the wilderness to listen to His teaching, who had fasted long days in order to tarry with Him, for whom He had worked the splendid miracle of feeding with five small loaves five thousand men—would He, I ask, have hesitated to explain Himself and to remove their mistake? Had He intended only a metaphor, would He, when misunderstood, have repeated His original expression six times over in language still more clear, still more emphatic, still more unmistakable?

Not only He would not, but in common honesty He could not. Had He intended only a metaphor, He would have realized, not only that He was in the present deceiving the Jews, but also that in the

future—aye, and for ever—He would deceive the countless millions of that Church which He had come from heaven to found. Had he intended only a metaphor, by every obligation of fidelity, of charity, and of justice, He would have been bound to explain —by fidelity to the Divine message with which He had been entrusted (John v. 58), and in discharge of His office as the Prophet of God; by charity towards the men whom He loved, with a love passing human understanding; and by justice, too, justice to God, justice to Himself, justice to those whom His deceptive language had alienated and robbed of everlasting life. Will a rational being maintain that our Saviour, who died for souls, and would have died, had need been, for a single soul—will a reasonable man believe that Jesus allowed multitudes of His disciples to leave Him and to lose eternal life when by a word He could have called them back? 'Come back,' He would have said, 'why do you leave Me? Come back, ye simple ones, why are ye offended? I have, no doubt, asked you to eat My Flesh and to drink My Blood; but I did not mean it at all! It was only a figure of speech! It was a mere metaphor! I only meant to ask of you what many a time I had asked of you before, and what many a time before with delight and alacrity you had freely promised Me. The Real Presence is a mere spectre of your own minds. What I want from you is nothing more than this—that you should believe in Me, that you should have faith in Me.'

But our Lord did not say this.

On the contrary, He let them go.

Then, with sad eyes, He turned to the Twelve and asked:

'Will ye also go away?' (68).

With sad and sorrowing eyes; for even in the College of Apostles He saw that there was one unbeliever in the Real Presence, who a year from that time was about to become *the* Judas—the great traitor of the world. And Christ said:

'One of *you* is a devil!' (71).

VII

In this modern world of ours the sceptic still asks: 'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?' The Real Presence is denied, scorned, ridiculed by unbelievers. There stands One in the midst of them, and they know Him not. Truly the Lord is in this place, and they recognise Him not; He comes unto His own, and His own receive Him not.

But you have been blessed with the gift of faith. Therefore, when the Sacred Host is exposed on the altar, and Jesus, shrouded in sacramental veils, is raised aloft to bless and sanctify you, make a great act of faith in the Real Presence—for your own sake and to atone for the blasphemies of those who revile and believe not. Say to our Lord in the Sacred Host what St. Peter said to Him face to face: 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have known and have believed that Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.'

LECTURE IV

CHRIST'S INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST—I

In the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, as we have seen, our Lord, in clear, emphatic, and unmistakable language, promised the future boon of the Blessed Sacrament. It was objected that His words might bear a metaphorical interpretation; that they might stand for a merely figurative eating and drinking; that they might imply nothing more than faith in Him. But this sophism we refuted. We pointed out that Christ's words not only did not bear the metaphorical sense suggested, but that they did bear another metaphorical sense which, if applied to them, robbed our Saviour's language of all meaning. We further pointed out that the four Evangelists understood the words literally; that St. Paul understood them literally; that the Jewish multitude understood them literally; that the Apostles understood them literally; that our Lord Himself understood them literally. As we showed, the words might in the abstract bear a meaning either literal or figurative. If literal, they are in this context as clear as sunlight; if figurative, they are in this context sheer nonsense.

We now pass on to the institution of the Holy Eucharist. In the Synagogue of Capharnaum, the Real Presence was only promised. In the Guest Chamber of Jerusalem, about a year afterwards, that promise was fulfilled and the Real Presence was instituted.

What is the evidence for this institution? It is abundant. Not only the three Evangelists—St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke—but St. Paul also describe this institution in almost identical words. It will therefore be enough for our present purpose if we quote only St. Matthew's account:

'And whilst they were at supper Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to His disciples, and said: Take ye and eat; this is My Body. And, taking the chalice, He gave thanks and gave to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament which shall be shed' (is now being shed) 'for many unto remission of sins' (Matt. xxvi. 26-28).

I

Let us now try to picture the scene.

Transport yourselves, therefore, in imagination into that Guest Chamber in Jerusalem where our Lord for the last time celebrated the Pasch, or Passover. It was the 'Last Supper.' It was the night on which He was betrayed. The eve of His death had come. His life was nearly lived. His work was nearly over. In a few hours He would be nailed to the Cross. His Apostles were crowding

around Him, pale and anxious, hanging on His every word, watching His every look, noting His every action. With them He had eaten for the last time the Paschal Lamb, the type of Himself, and with this last celebration of that chief rite of the Old Law He had buried that Law. Types now give way before the anti-type. Shadows are supplanted by the substance. Appearances pass into the reality. Christ Himself is the new Paschal Lamb, about to be sacrificed for the sins of the world, about to be eaten for the life of the world.

Yes, His solemn promise, made a year before in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, Jesus is now about to carry into performance. He is about to change bread into His Body, to convert wine into His Blood. Nor were the Apostles unprepared for this, their first Communion. The great Teacher had long instructed their minds and trained their hearts for this grand celebration—the Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Eucharist, the visible centre of the Christian religion, the centre towards which converge all the rays of the Christian worship, the centre whereon are focussed all the rites and ritual of the Catholic Church.

Moreover, as the Apostles noted our Lord's reverential preparations, must not their thoughts have travelled back to that strange scene enacted a year before in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, when with such startling clearness the Master had first promised to give 'His Flesh to be true meat, and His Blood to be true drink'? Vividly they must have recalled the amazement, the bewilderment, the incredulity, with which His promise had been received.

Well they must have remembered His plain and clear language, His relentless repetitions, His uncompromising reiterations of the truth, the disregard of consequences with which He had driven home the doctrine of the Real Presence. Aye, and with many a pang, too, must they have pictured afresh those vast crowds who had followed Him from afar, and had fasted long for His sake, whom with love unstinted He had loved, and whom, by a stupendous miracle, He had fed in the desert, and yet in the end, taking scandal at His promise of the Blessed Sacrament, had turned their backs upon Him and had walked no more with Him.

Yes, and keenly, too, must have come back the piteous look with which Jesus had turned His plaintive face to the Twelve, and had asked: 'Will ye also leave Me?'

And then their anxious countenances must have grown still more anxious, as memory traced anew how on that occasion He had warned the Twelve, 'One of you is a devil'; and in his heart of hearts each Apostle tremblingly put the question to himself, 'Who is this traitor? Is it I?'

But doubts about the Real Presence troubled them no more. Vanished for ever were their scruples about the possibility of the Blessed Sacrament. No longer were they tempted to ask, 'How can this man give us His flesh to eat?' For to them this 'Man' was also God. Faith had taken the place of doubt. Unbelief had changed into adoration. His ability to perform His promise they questioned no more, for had they not seen Him begin His public life by

changing water into wine at the marriage-feast of Cana in Galilee? Why, therefore, should they be surprised to see Him ending His life by changing wine into His Blood in the Supper Chamber in Jerusalem? Had they not seen Him, a year before, multiply five loaves to feed five thousand people? Why, then, should they marvel now to see Him convert bread into His Body to feed the world?

II

Then into His hands our Lord took bread and He took wine. And just as at that imperious bidding of Omnipotence, 'Let there be light,' and light began to be; just as at that humble bidding of Mary the Virgin, 'Be it done unto me according to Thy word,' God began to exist as Man in a maiden's womb, so, at the gentle bidding of Christ, 'This is My Body, this is My Blood,' from beneath the accidents of bread and wine, the substances of bread and wine ceased to be, and in their place came the living Christ, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity. For these words of our Lord were not only declarative, they were also operative. He speaks and Nature obeys. To the ruler whose son lay sick at Capharnaum when Christ said, 'Go thy way, thy son liveth' (John iv. 50), the words accomplished what they also expressed, and the sick man on the instant grew strong and well. In like manner, when over the bread He declared, 'This is My Body,' and when over the wine He declared, 'This is My Blood,' these words of power effected what they also declared—

they changed bread and wine into His Body and Blood.

Read the words of institution of the Blessed Sacrament chronicled by four of the inspired writers; read them in the light of Christ's promise made at Capharnaum, and no argument is needed to prove that they must be understood, and that Christ meant them to be understood in their literal sense. In that literal sense the Apostles in the Supper Chamber understood them. They asked no questions. They raised no difficulties. They made no comment. They acquiesced and adored. The Evangelists, too, when they narrate the incident add no word of comment, because they deem the meaning clear. Nor need we add any. No word of explanation can make that meaning clearer. No word of sophistry can obscure that meaning. It is enough to recall the facts—namely, that in the promise of the Holy Eucharist in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, Christ said:

'The Bread that I *will* give is My Flesh,' and that in the institution of the Holy Eucharist in the Supper Chamber of Jerusalem, a year afterwards, He took bread, and changing it into His Body, said:

'This *is* My Body.'

If there is not here a literal promise and a literal performance, then human language is devoid of meaning.

III

But in spite of its clearness, are there objections raised against this interpretation?

Yes, the greatest ingenuity has been displayed in

the effort to get rid of the literal meaning of the Scripture text, to prove that black is white, and hot cold, and the right hand the same as the left. As with the promise, so with the institution of the Holy Eucharist, endless attempts have been made to twist the inspired language out of its plain meaning.

Before, however, we—in our next lecture—set forth these objections, let us point out that we Catholics are standing by the plain word of Scripture, and that opponents are assailing it. We defend the Bible text; they desert it. Our shield is over it; their sword is against it. The complaint is sometimes urged against us Catholics that, in the exposition and defence of our religion, we appeal to sources external to the Bible—to the Church, to tradition, to the fathers, to reason. But here, at least, we are not open to this charge. We might, indeed, have proved the Real Presence from other sources than the Bible; we are, in point of fact, proving it from the Bible alone.

We assert our belief, then, in the Real Presence, first because the Bible, in the sixth chapter of St. John, clearly says that Christ promised it:

'The Bread that I will give is My Flesh.'

And we assert our belief in the Real Presence, secondly, because the Bible, in four different places, clearly says that Christ fulfilled that promise. He took bread into His sacred hands, and He said:

'This is My Body.'

And He took the chalice of wine into His sacred hands, and He said:

'This is My Blood.'

Now, as we said before with regard to the words in which Christ promised the Holy Eucharist, so we say now with regard to the words in which He instituted it: plainer words you could not wish for. Try to express the Catholic doctrine in the simplest language the English tongue can supply, and simpler language than our Lord's you shall not find.

If, then, we are asked this question:

'Why do you Catholics believe that bread becomes Christ's Body?'

This is our answer:

'Because Christ said so!'

'And why do you believe that wine becomes Christ's Blood?'

'Because Christ said so!'

And to the objection that the Real Presence is an impossibility—'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?'—and therefore that Christ neither instituted nor promised it, we retort that Christ, most plainly, both promised and instituted it, and that consequently it cannot be an impossibility.

Opponents, therefore, are enemies of the Bible. Catholics are its champions. Rejection of the Blessed Sacrament, promised by Jesus in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, and instituted by Him in the Supper Chamber of Jerusalem, is a denial of Holy Writ and a blasphemy against the Son of God.

LECTURE V

CHRIST'S INSTITUTION OF THE EUCHARIST—II

We showed last time that Christ had not only unmistakably promised, but that He had also plainly instituted, the Blessed Sacrament.

Opponents, however, object against the words of institution—just as they objected against the words of promise—that our Lord's language was not literal, but only metaphorical.

Let us look into that objection.

Opponents of the Holy Eucharist urge that Christ did not mean what He seemed to say. They contend that as, in His promise of the Real Presence, our Lord's words, 'The Bread that I will give is My Flesh,' referred only to a figurative, and not to a real, eating; so, in His institution of the Real Presence, His words, 'This is My Body,' referred, indeed, to a real eating, but only meant, 'This represents My Body.' And, again, they remind us that our Lord said, 'I am the Door,' when He only meant, 'I represent the Door,' and that He said, 'I am the Vine,' when He only meant, 'I represent the Vine.' And did not St. Paul say, 'The rock was

Christ,' when He only meant, 'The rock represents Christ'?

What are we to answer to this objection?

First, let us point out the utter inconsistency of this line of opposing argument.

When, in the promise of the Holy Eucharist, our Lord bade us eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, opponents, in order to escape the force of these plain words, maintained that no real eating or drinking was intended, but only faith in Christ.

Now, when Jesus fulfils His promise and changes bread and wine into His Body and Blood, these same opponents take refuge in another, and quite different, explanation. They say: Of course Christ meant a real eating, and a real drinking; but only of bread and wine; not of flesh and blood. They assure us that bread and wine are not changed into Christ's Flesh and Blood, but only into the symbols of Christ's Flesh and Blood.

I

Let us, then, go back to the sixth chapter of St. John, and for 'My Flesh' let us substitute 'symbol of My Flesh,' and for 'My Blood' let us substitute 'symbol of My Blood,' and then see what becomes of the sense of the passage.

51. 'I am the living Bread which came down from heaven.'

52. 'If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever; and the Bread that I will give is' (*the symbol of*) 'My Flesh for the life of the world.'

53. 'The Jews, therefore, strove among them-

selves, saying: How can this man give us' (*bread, the symbol of*) 'His flesh to eat?'

54. 'Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say unto you: Except ye eat' (*bread, the symbol of*) 'the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink' (*wine, the symbol of*) 'His Blood, ye shall not have life in you.'

55. 'He that eateth' (*bread, the symbol of*) 'My Flesh, and drinketh' (*wine, the symbol of*) 'My Blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.'

56. 'For' (*bread, the symbol of*) 'My Flesh is true meat, and' (*wine, the symbol of*) 'My Blood is true drink.'

57. 'He that eateth' (*the symbol of*) 'My Flesh and drinketh' (*the symbol of*) 'My Blood abideth in Me, and I in him.'

58. 'As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth (*the symbol of*) Me, the same shall live by Me.'

So much for the inconsistency, and indeed absurdity, of this objection.

II

Let us next point out the danger of this line of argument.

Assuredly this substitution of symbols for realities *is* a dangerous line of argument. For should it be allowed, wherever in Holy Scripture we meet with a doctrine hard to understand, to make the verb 'to be' equivalent to the verb 'to represent,' it would become easy, not only to overthrow the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, but also to overturn the whole fabric of Christian teaching.

Take some instances.

For example, in demonstrating the Divinity of Christ, we make much of that great text in the first verse of St. John's Gospel:

'The Word was God.'

But here the Unitarian might interpose, and, using the Protestant argument against the Eucharist, might assure us that the text proves nothing; for as 'to be' stands only for 'to represent,' 'the Word was God' can only mean 'the Word represented God,' and obviously the representative of God is not God Himself; therefore, 'the Word was God' means only that 'the Word was *not* God.'

Is that a fair argument? And if not, why not? If 'This is My Body' means in reality 'This is not My Body,' why cannot 'the Word was God' mean in reality 'the Word was not God'?

The objection, therefore, proves too much. For if it destroys the doctrine of the Real Presence, it with equal cogency destroys the doctrine of the Incarnation. If it overthrows the Real Presence, it also overturns Christianity.

III

The whole question, therefore, at issue is this: What is the first, and plain, and obvious meaning of 'This is My Body, This is My Blood'?

Is it literal, or is it metaphorical?

Are these utterances of our Lord parallel with those other expressions: 'I am the Door,' 'I am the Vine,' 'The Rock was Christ'?

No! The latter expressions are as plainly figurative as the former are plainly literal. The latter expressions no one ever supposed to be literal. As figurative they present no difficulty. As metaphors they are at once understood. On the other hand, the expressions, 'This is My Body, This is My Blood,' are as plainly literal. Their obvious meaning is literal. As literal they present no difficulty. As figurative they are unintelligible.

IV

Yes, the words of institution of the Blessed Sacrament are the literal performance of a literal promise. The promise was (John vi. 58):

'He that eateth *Me*, the same shall live by Me.'

The performance of the promise was (Matt. xxvi. 26):

'Take ye and eat: this is My Body.'

If these words are not literal, then human language was given, not to express, but to hide, thought.

However, if the words of promise and the words of institution are to be taken figuratively, the burden of proof of their figurative character lies on those who reject the plain meaning of Christ's words.

To make good their attack opponents have two points to demonstrate: first, that these words *may* be taken as metaphors; secondly, that they *must* be taken as metaphors.

And they can demonstrate neither.

Certainly the quotation from St. Paul, 'The Rock was Christ,' in no way helps them. For the Apostle

is careful to explain that the rock in question was a spiritual rock, and that the expression in question was a metaphor. The words are:

'They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them. And that Rock was Christ' (1 Cor. x. 4).

St. Paul was careful to explain that his words were figurative. Has any inspired writer been careful to explain that 'This is My Body' was figurative? And if so, where?

Still less do the illustrations from the 'Door' and the 'Vine' help the opponent.

For what is the exact meaning of 'I am the Door; I am the Vine'? We are told that 'This is My Body' means 'This represents My Body,' just as 'I am the Door or the Vine' means 'I represent the Door or the Vine.'

But, we answer, the word 'represent' cannot be substituted for 'am' in either the Door sentence or the Vine sentence. In these metaphors Christ did not mean 'I represent the Door,' or 'I represent the Vine.' What the expressions do mean is this: 'I resemble the Door,' 'I resemble the Vine'; just as when we said of the bloodthirsty rebels in the Indian Mutiny that 'they were tigers,' we did not mean that they 'represented,' but that they 'resembled,' tigers.

If, therefore, there is a parallelism between the two sets of expressions, as 'I am the Door' means 'I resemble the Door,' so 'This is My Body' must mean 'This resembles My Body'; and as 'I am the Vine' means 'I resemble the Vine,' so 'This is My Blood' must mean 'This resembles My Blood.'

An interpretation surely which makes Christ's words unintelligible!

The following passage from Theophylact[1] meets this objection. He writes:

'Observe that the bread eaten by us is not merely a figuring of the Flesh of the Lord, but the Lord's Flesh itself. For He did not say, "The bread which I shall give is a figure of flesh," but "it is My Flesh." For this bread is *transformed*' (*i.e.*, transubstantiated) 'by the hidden words, through the mystic benediction, and the coming of the Holy Ghost, into the Flesh of the Lord. Nor let it disturb anyone that the bread must be believed to be flesh. For even while the Lord walked in the flesh, and received aliment from bread, this bread which He ate was transubstantiated' (μετεβάλλετο) 'into His Body and became like His Sacred Flesh, and contributed, after a human manner, to the increase and support thereof. Therefore now also, in the Eucharist, the bread is transubstantiated' (same word) 'into the Flesh of the Lord.

'And how is it, you ask, that it is not flesh but bread that appeareth to us?

'In order that we may not feel an abhorrence to the use thereof.'

V

The literal meaning, therefore, of the words of institution of the Blessed Sacrament is clear as noonday. But the literal meaning is the Catholic meaning. So to avoid that, opponents foist upon

[1] 'Com. in Joan,' cap. vi., p. 594. Venice, 1754.

the words a metaphorical meaning which changes plain sense into downright nonsense.

But the objicient has not yet finished. He further argues that the Blessed Sacrament is a mere memorial of Christ. For did not our Lord say:

'Do this for a commemoration of Me'? (Luke xxii. 19). And was not that to institute the Eucharist only as a memento of Himself? Now, if the Eucharist be a mere memorial of Christ, it cannot be Christ Himself!

Such is the difficulty. Every Catholic child knows the answer. The Holy Eucharist is a memorial, but not a mere memorial, of Christ. For the Holy Eucharist is Christ, and is also a memorial of the death of Christ. Let us explain.

Christ's Body and Blood can never again be really —*i.e.*, physically—separated. But the symbolical separation which takes place in Holy Mass—effected by putting the Body and Blood under the species of bread, and the Blood and Body under the species of wine—is a memorial of the physical separation which took place at His death. When, by the words of Consecration, Christ caused His Body to be present under the accidents of bread, and caused His Blood to be present under the accidents of wine, He did not actually die, but He did undergo a change of state, in which, by this mystic separation of Body and Blood, He placed Himself *equivalently* in the condition of death.[1]

Consequently, as we have pointed out before, the first Eucharistic celebration in the Supper Chamber

[1] His Body was now under Bread and His Blood under Wine.

in Jerusalem was, not merely a Sacrament, it was also a Sacrifice. It was the first Unbloody Sacrifice of the New Law.

It was the first Mass.

Hence, before the Crucifixion, in the words of Consecration, our Lord said:

'This is My Body which is now being given for you' (Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24).

And again:

'This is the Chalice, the new testament in My Blood, which is now being poured out for you' (Luke xxii. 20; *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24). Such are the readings in the original Greek.

Thus it is that in Holy Mass, after the Second Consecration—that of the Chalice—the priest repeats this command of Christ, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.'

No one, surely, with even an elementary knowledge either of Catholic teaching or of the text of Scripture, would urge these words as an argument against the Real Presence. The words do, in fact, prove the doctrine in disproof of which they are adduced.

VI

A well-known author of the 'Life of Christ'[1] argues against the literal interpretation of the Eucharistic words in this characteristic strain:

'To turn metaphor into fact, poetry into prose, rhetoric into logic, parable into systematic theology, is at once fatal and absurd.'

[1] Farrar, vol. ii., p. 292, third edition.

What, you exclaim—metaphor! poetry! rhetoric! parable! It makes one rub one's eyes. Just listen:

'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath everlasting life' (John vi. 55).

Does that sound like metaphor, poetry, rhetoric, parable?

Listen again:

'Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you' (John vi. 54).

Does that strike you as metaphor, poetry, rhetoric, parable?

Listen once more:

'This is My Body; this is My Blood. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation unto himself' (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22, 24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25).

Would you call that precisely metaphor, poetry, rhetoric, parable?

Christ instituted the Blessed Sacrament on the night preceding His death. Surely a solemn hour! Does that hour appear to you a fit time for unintelligible metaphor, or poetry, or rhetoric, or parable?

Do you believe—can you bring yourself to believe—that on that sacred night of the Last Supper, when Jesus for the last time celebrated the great central rite of the Old Law—the eating of the Paschal Lamb, the type of Himself—and by that last celebration abolished for ever the Old Dispensation; do you believe that on that solemn night when He inaugurated the New Law and instituted the Holy

Eucharist, the great central rite of the New Dispensation; do you believe that on that awful night when His soul was sorrowful even unto death—one Apostle being about to denounce Him, and one to deny Him, and all to desert Him—on that terrible night when His Body was to be crushed to the earth by His burden of anguish, and to sweat blood under those dark olive-trees in the moonlit Garden of Gethsemane—on that fearful night, the eve of His crucifixion and His death; do you believe that, at such a time, Jesus Christ was trifling, toying, tampering with words—that He was putting forth metaphor instead of fact, poetry instead of prose, rhetoric instead of logic, parable instead of systematic theology? Do you believe that, at that supreme hour of His life, our Divine Master was uttering metaphors so meaningless, poetry so vague, rhetoric so obscure, parable so ambiguous, that His own Apostles at the time, and the whole Christian world, with hardly an exception, for fifteen centuries after, took Him literally when He only meant to be figurative?

And if any man has the credulity to believe all this, that the Jews, the disciples, the Apostles, the whole Christian Church for fifteen centuries—until Wickcliffe, Luther, Calvin, Zwingle and company, with their heterogeneous but anti-Catholic theories, came to set the world right—mistook metaphor for fact, and poetry for prose, and rhetoric for logic, and parable for systematic theology—then, let such a man explain why, when the Jews murmured, and the disciples were scandalized, and both asked,

'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?'; when they complained, 'This is a hard saying, and who can hear it?'; when they turned away from Christ and walked no more with Him; when they turned their backs on the Messias, and thus renounced eternal life—let such a one explain why the great heart of God which glowed with love for these Jews—aye, with more than a mother's love for her child—these Jews, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, unto whom in particular Jesus had been sent—why He did not call them back and undeceive them! It would have been all so easy! He would have said:

'Foolish men! why do you murmur? Unthinking men! why do you complain? It is but a trifle that I have asked of you! It is true that if ye do eat My Flesh and do drink My Blood, I have destined you for eternal heaven. It is true that if ye do not eat My Flesh and do not drink My Blood, I have doomed you to eternal hell. It is true that I then took bread, and blessed it, and said, plainly and simply, "This is My Body." It is true that I then took wine, and blessed it, and said, plainly and simply, "This is My Blood."

'Yes, all that is true!

'But what of that? You see, you must not take Me seriously. All this is mere metaphor, not fact; mere poetry, not prose; mere rhetoric, not logic; mere parable, not systematic theology! I never meant what I said. For by this Sacrifice of the New Law, just established, I intend something far inferior to the Sacrifice of the Old Law just abolished. By this Christian eating of the Real

Lamb, which is Myself, I intend something incomparably less solemn than was that Jewish eating of the Pascal Lamb, which was only the type of Myself. In one word, by the institution of the Holy Eucharist — the culminating point of My mission, the crowning act of My life—I only mean this, that in memory of Me, you should occasionally eat a bit of common bread, and drink a few drops of ordinary wine !'

LECTURE VI

ST. PAUL'S TESTIMONY: THE EUCHARIST AS AN INSTITUTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In the Synagogue of Capharnaum our Lord clearly promised the future institution of the Holy Eucharist.

A year afterwards, in the Supper Chamber in Jerusalem, He fulfilled that promise and instituted the Holy Eucharist.

We now go on to inquire what records there are in the Bible of the Holy Eucharist as an existing institution.

Can we find any such records? If we can, we shall have a cumulative argument based on the promise, the institution, and the use, which will prove to demonstration the dogma of the Blessed Sacrament.

What, then, says the Bible?

To this question I reply that the Bible furnishes, not one merely, but many such records, of the Real Presence. From the Bible we learn definitely that, in the Early Church, the Blessed Sacrament was a well-established and well-recognised institution.

Of these records, however, the narrow scope of these lectures compels us to confine our attention to two. These two will, however, abundantly suffice to establish the practical teaching of the Real Presence during the first stages of Christianity.

We designedly restrict our study to the evidence furnished by one Epistle of St. Paul—the first to the Corinthians—and to two chapters of that one epistle, the tenth and eleventh.

In two chapters of one short letter St. Paul twice assumes the literal meaning of the Eucharistic words used by Christ when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament. Indeed, the Apostle argues from the Real Presence as from a central doctrine of Christianity, and as from a prime fact about which there was no dispute, and concerning which there could be no doubt.

I

The former of these passages (1 Cor x. 16-20) runs thus: 'The chalice of benediction' (*i.e.*, the cup of blessing), 'which we bless, is it not the communion' (*i.e.*, the partaking) 'of the Blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?

'For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.

'Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

'But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.

'You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils.'

A

The Corinthian Christians here addressed were converts from paganism, whom St. Paul, by his preaching, had turned from the worship of idols—from the worship of Zeus and Herè, of Apollo and Artemis, of Ares and Aphroditè—to the worship of the one true God. The Apostle is teaching his converts to take no part in the idolatrous sacrifices going on around them: to drink not of the drinks, to eat not of the meats, offered in sacrifice to deities who were in reality devils.

Do not, he says, partake of wine offered to demons. Why not? Because you are partakers of the Blood of Christ.

Do not, he says, partake of meat sacrificed to devils. Why not? Because you are partakers of the Body of Christ.

'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the partaking of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of Christ?'

B

The Apostle then proceeds to unfold his reasons for this prohibition:

'For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one Bread.'

What do these words mean?

They mean this, that Holy Communion makes us one with Christ, and one with each other. It makes us members of Christ, and therefore members one of another.

First, then, Holy Communion makes us one with Christ. How? Because it assimilates us to Christ. Natural food is assimilated by the person eating with himself; but supernatural food assimilates the person eating with itself. He who eats natural bread made of wheat transforms that bread materially into himself. But he who eats that supernatural Bread, which is Christ, is transformed spiritually by that Bread, and is made spiritually one with Christ, so that he, the person eating, may say: 'I live—nay, not I, but Christ liveth in me.' That is our Lord's distinct promise, for He said: 'He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, abideth in Me, and I in him' (John vi. 57). And so St. Paul says: 'Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?' (1 Cor. vi. 15). And again: 'We are members of Christ's Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones' (Ephes. v. 30).

Secondly, Holy Communion makes us one, not only with Christ, but also with one another. That unifying principle is Christ's Body. For Christ's Body, which every communicant receives, is but one Body. When communicants kneel at the altar-rails, each receives Christ's Body, His whole Body, His living Body, and all receive one and the same Body. For Christ has that one Body. Consequently, as the Holy Eucharist unites each communicant with Christ, it must of necessity unite each communicant with all

other communicants. The one Body of Christ which all receive is the bond of union which makes us all to be 'one bread, one body.'

C

Now mark that St. Paul's argument presupposes the Real Presence. It takes for granted that all communicants are made one body by eating of the one Body of Christ.

For if the Holy Eucharist, which we call 'Bread' because it has the appearances of bread, is not Christ's Body, but is only the sign or symbol of Christ's Body, then all communicants are partakers, not of 'one Bread,' but of many breads, and cannot thus be called 'one bread, one body.' For the bread eaten in the north, or the west, is not one with the bread eaten in the south, or the east. It is not one bread which is eaten to-day and the same bread which is eaten to-morrow. It may be the same kind of bread, but it is not numerically one and the same bread. Yet, if communicants do not all secure numerically one and the same Divine Body, the very foundation of St. Paul's argument vanishes into thin air.

It will perhaps be urged that Eucharistic breads, eaten at different times and in different places, are called 'one bread' because they have always one and the same meaning, because they symbolize one and the same thing—namely, the Body of Christ.

This answer is, however, insufficient. All half-crown pieces symbolize one and the same thing—

namely, our Emperor-King. Can we therefore say that all half-crowns are one and the same half-crown? Again, all the sacrifices of the Old Law symbolized one and the same thing—namely, the one Sacrifice of Christ; were, then, all the sacrifices of the Old Law one and the same sacrifice? Was it, for example, one and the same paschal lamb which year by year for centuries was sacrificed by the Jews as a type and figure of the future Sacrifice of Christ? If these many breads may be called 'one bread' because they all symbolize one thing, then those many lambs may be called one lamb because they all symbolized one thing! And if all who eat of these many breads become 'one bread,' then all who ate of these many lambs must have become 'one lamb.' And this is absurd.

If St. Paul's words mean the Real Presence, they are clear, cogent, and convincing. If they mean the Real Absence, they are bewildering and meaningless.

D

The Apostle, then, proceeds to prove why those who, by Holy Communion, are made one with Christ must not partake of the meats and drinks sacrificed on the altars of idols. A Corinthian convert might have objected that it was only the wine and the flesh-meat he cared for, and not the idolatrous sacrifice. Yes, replies St. Paul, but you cannot eat of the meat sacrificed without sharing in the sacrifice. When the Jews ate of the victims sacrificed on the altar of God, were they not partakers of the altar

of God? (verse 18). When the heathens ate of the victims sacrificed on the altars of devils, were they not partakers with devils? (verse 20). The rule, therefore, is a general one—namely, that to eat of the sacrifice is to partake of the altar (verse 18).

Therefore, argues St. Paul, as you partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, and thus are one with Christ, how can it be lawful for you to partake also of the wine and meats of the idols, and thus be made one with devils? He says:

'You cannot drink of the chalice of the Lord and of the chalice of devils. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils.'

Once again, let me point out, if St. Paul's argument is valid, he must refer in each of the three cases—of the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Corinthian converts—to a real altar, and to a real sacrifice offered on that altar. For his argument is from analogy, and supposes identity of character in the terms compared. It runs thus:

With the Jews it was a real altar and a real sacrifice.

With the Gentiles it was a real altar and a real sacrifice.

Therefore with the Corinthian Christians it was a real altar and a real sacrifice.

But a real altar and a real sacrifice imply a real victim.

With the Jews it was a real victim.

With the Gentiles it was a real victim.

Therefore with the Corinthian Christians it was a real victim.

And this real Victim—Christ—supposes the Real Presence of this Victim. For you cannot sacrifice an absent victim.

E

To sum up. St. Paul compares the altar or table of Christians with the altar or table of pagans. But altar and table stand for sacrifice. Therefore the Apostle compares the sacrifice of Christians with the sacrifices of pagans. But the sacrifices of pagans were real offerings of real victims really present. Therefore the sacrifice of Christians is the real offering of a real Victim really present. And that Victim is Christ.

Understand St. Paul to be teaching the Real Presence, and his argument is unanswerable.

Understand him to be teaching the Real Absence, and his argument is unintelligible.

II

The second passage of St. Paul, to which we made reference, occurs in the next chapter of the same letter (1 Cor. xi. 23-29), and runs as follows:

'I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night on which He was betrayed, took bread and, giving thanks, broke, and said:

'Take ye and eat; this is My Body which shall be delivered for you' (or, which is now being broken for you). 'This do for the commemoration of Me.

'In like manner also the chalice, after He had supped, saying:

'This chalice is the new testament in My Blood; this do ye, as often as ye shall drink, for the commemoration of Me. For as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, ye shall show the death of the Lord until He come.

'Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

'But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice.

'For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment' (*i.e.*, damnation) 'to himself, not discerning the Body of the Lord.'

A

St. Paul is here exhorting his Corinthian converts to a holy and devout use of the Blessed Sacrament. He first gives an account of its institution as he had 'received it of the Lord.'

Notice, he had 'received it of the Lord'—not from any Evangelist, not from any Apostle, but directly from the lips of Christ Himself.

The institution of the Holy Eucharist St. Paul describes almost in the very words of St. Luke, and substantially in the same words as St. Matthew and St. Mark.

And, then, he adds his own commentary.

Now, let us ask this question: If the words 'This is My Body' had been intended by Christ, and understood by St. Paul, as a metaphor, is it not a singular fact that the Apostle, in explaining them, drops no

hint of their figurative meaning? St. Paul no more suggests a metaphor than did St. John, or St. Matthew, or St. Mark, or St. Luke. If our Lord intended a metaphor, all the inspired writers are most mysteriously silent about it. Not only do they not suggest a metaphor; on the contrary, they all wrote as if the words were clear, plain, literal.[1]

B

'Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.'

An awful denunciation assuredly is this! 'Guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord!' The expression is stern and energetic. The Jews who crucified Christ were 'guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord'; and St. Paul here assures us that the communicant who receives in mortal sin is, like the Jews, a Deicide, a God-murderer, a man with the guilt of God's Blood upon his soul!

[1] We may note in passing how, in verse 27, St. Paul unmistakably teaches the Catholic doctrine of Communion under one kind. Under each species of the Holy Eucharist lies hid the whole living Body of Christ. Under the appearances of wine is the Sacred Blood *and* Body; under the appearances of bread is the Sacred Body *and* Blood. He says: 'Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body *and* Blood of the Lord.'

Where the Catholic Bible reads 'or' the Protestant 'Authorised Version' reads 'and,' and founds a whole heresy on the false translation. It is gratifying to find that the 'Revised Version' has corrected this error.

In like manner the same Apostle teaches, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (verse 66), that—

'Those who have tasted the heavenly gift, and are fallen away, crucify again the Son of God and turn Christ into a mockery.'

Could any denunciation be more appalling?

Are you, then, prepared to believe that this fearful menace was intended for those who carelessly eat and drink, not Christ's Body and Blood, but only the signs and symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, only a little bread and wine? How can a communicant, who receives unworthily a Sacred Host, offend against Christ's Body and Blood, if Christ's Body and Blood are not in that Host?

It will be answered, perhaps, that the offence is against the symbols of Christ's Body and Blood.

Now, that to receive such symbols unworthily would be a venial fault, I very willingly admit; that it would be the mortal sin of bloodguiltiness against Christ, I most emphatically deny.

That the unworthy reception of mere bread and wine would merit some slight punishment, a reasonable man will easily concede; that it would deserve eternal damnation, a man in his senses will not assert.

For surely disrespect to a symbol is not the same offence as disrespect to the person symbolized? Take an instance: To bespatter the statue of the American President, would that be the same offence as to bespatter the President himself? To strike the English King would be a deadly crime; a penny bears the symbol of the English King—to strike a penny, would that be a deadly crime? To assassinate

the Pope would be sacrilege and murder; a papal medal bears the symbol of the Pope—to efface the Pope from a papal medal, would that be sacrilege and murder? The manna in the desert was a symbol of Christ; was a Jew who, in a state of sin, ate manna guilty of Christ's Body and Blood? Did he eat damnation unto himself? The paschal lamb which the Apostles ate just before the institution of the Eucharist was a symbol of Christ, and Judas ate it unworthily; was Judas thereby as guilty as when afterwards from our Lord's hands he may[1] have received in mortal sin the real Body and Blood of Jesus Christ?

Anyone who knows with what scant respect the bread and wine have been treated in the Protestant Establishment will hesitate to affirm that disrespect to the symbols of Christ's Body and Blood is blood-guiltiness against God and deserving of eternal damnation.

If St. Paul is supposing the Real Presence, this terrible denunciation is most apt. If he is supposing the Real Absence, this terrible denunciation is a childish exaggeration.

C

The Apostle continues:

'For let a man prove himself; and so, let him eat of that Bread and drink of that Wine.'

Yes, before Holy Communion, let a man prove himself. Let him diligently examine his conscience

[1] 'May,' because it is not certain that Judas received Holy Communion at the Last Supper.

and purge his soul of sin in the Sacrament of Penance specially designed for that end; and let him, out of reverence, communicate fasting. In the Church of God, of course, confession and fasting are required before Holy Communion. But what is the preparation required in the Churches where the bread and wine are but symbols of an absent Christ? Neither confession nor fasting!

D

The Apostle continues:

'For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation unto himself; not discerning the Body of the Lord.'

Yet how can you discern in the bread the Body of the Lord if the Body of the Lord is not there?

How can you discern as really present what in fact is really absent?

Once again, if St. Paul is here teaching the Real Presence, his words are plain, measured, unmistakable. If he is teaching the Real Absence, his words are obscure, intemperate, unintelligible. For are men to lose their eternal souls, and to burn in endless fire, because under the symbols of bread and wine they fail to 'discern' Christ's Body, which is not there, which Christ never taught to be there, and which St. Paul himself never supposed to be there? Surely not!

Therefore in this great dogmatic passage St. Paul upholds the Real Presence of Jesus in the Holy Eucharist as a truth notorious to all, disputed by none, clear as the noonday.

E

The terrible guilt of an unworthy Communion St. Paul considers under a two-fold aspect: in relation to the object ill-used; in relation to the person ill-using it. The object ill-used is the Body of the Lord unworthily received. The ill-use of that object is the 'not discerning the Body of the Lord.'

As regards the object ill-used, the sinner is 'guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.'

As regards the ill-use of that object, the sinner 'eateth and drinketh damnation unto himself.'

It is, however, objected against the Catholic interpretation of these two great passages from St. Paul that in both the Apostle speaks of the bread after the consecration as still being bread. In the tenth chapter, he says: 'The *bread* which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?' And in the eleventh chapter: 'Whosoever shall eat the *bread* unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.' Therefore, it is urged, what St. Paul calls bread must be bread; and if bread it cannot be Christ's Body!

I retort this foolish objection thus:

What St. Paul calls Christ's Body must be Christ's Body; and if Christ's Body it cannot be bread!

Moreover, is it not a common figure of speech, not only in Scripture, but in every language, and notably in English, to call a thing which has been changed into another thing by the name which it bore before the change? Take some instances. Can we not say: 'The boy has become a man'? 'The wife is a

widow'? 'The mother has lost all her children'? In the ninth chapter of St. John's Gospel, which is wholly occupied with the cure of the man born blind, our Lord bids the sufferer go and wash in the Pool of Siloe. He obeys; he is cured. He says: 'I went; I washed; I see.' Yet six verses afterwards he is again called 'the blind man.' 'The Pharisees, therefore, say to the *blind* man.' Yet no reader supposes that he was then blind. Again, in the Book of Exodus (vii. 12), after Aaron has changed his rod into a serpent, and the Egyptian magicians have changed their rods into serpents, we are told that 'Aaron's rod devoured their rods.' Yet no reader supposes that what were called 'rods' were not serpents. Again, when we read in Scripture that 'the blind see,' do we object that if they see they cannot be blind? Or when 'the lame walk,' that if they walk they cannot be lame? Or when 'the deaf hear,' that if they hear they cannot be deaf? And if no man argues in this way in these cases, why is the objection made that if, after the change of bread into Christ's Body, that Body is still called bread, bread it still must be?

In point of fact, even in Holy Mass, and immediately after the consecration, the living Body of Christ is still called Bread, 'The Holy *Bread* of eternal life'; and again, just before the Communion, 'I will receive the Heavenly *Bread*.'

And the Church has good reasons for this. We call the consecrated Host 'bread': first, because originally it was bread; secondly, because it keeps the appearances of bread; thirdly, because as bread

nourishes the body, so the Holy Eucharist nourishes the soul; and, lastly, the living Christ under the accidents of bread, we call 'Bread' because He so called Himself. He said: 'I am the *living Bread*' (John vi. 51).

Consequently, when Christ's Body is called 'Bread,' it is not the Body which is metaphorical and the Bread real; it is the Body which is real and the Bread metaphorical.

F

Here, then, we may conclude this part of our subject. The *mode* of the Real Presence we have yet to study. But the *fact* of the Real Presence we claim to have proved, and to have proved from the Bible alone.

And now to sum up our argument so far as it has gone. We have seen, first, that Christ, in the Synagogue of Capharnaum, clearly promised the Blessed Sacrament; secondly, that in the Guest Chamber of Jerusalem, a year afterwards, He clearly instituted it; thirdly, that St. Paul again and again clearly taught it as an existing Sacrament and Sacrifice in the Church. By the Catholic and literal interpretation of the Eucharistic passages of the Bible we avoid many strange inconsistencies, many outlandish anomalies; we harmonize a series of passages from the four Evangelists and St. Paul, the phraseology of which is undeniably similar, and we give to those passages a unity of meaning which is irresistible.

Opponents, on the other hand, shut their eyes to

this immense mass of cumulative evidence. For a very mountain of evidence is looming large in their eyes, and they will not see it. The literal sense they do not want, and therefore they will not have. They profess to defend the Bible, yet they desert it. They pretend to love the Scripture, yet they loathe its doctrine. They pose as champions of Holy Writ, yet they chafe at its teaching. They protest their reverence for God's Word, yet they wrest it from its obvious meaning. Pursued by the plain and repeated declarations of the inspired writings, they twist and turn, they double and dodge. They fasten upon some little phrase, some obscure expression, some trifling hint in a corner of the narrative, some other passage faintly resembling the text under discussion, and, flaunting this in our faces, they expect our serried phalanx of arguments to give way before the flimsy suggestion which their vague innuendoes afford. They might as well try to run down a line-of-battle ship with a paper boat. One passage they interpret to be one metaphor, and another passage, obviously parallel, to be another and an entirely different metaphor; themselves at variance as to what these metaphors are; powerless to explain the singular fact that while all the persons most deeply concerned understood the words literally, neither Christ, nor St. Paul, nor St. John, nor St. Matthew, nor St. Mark, nor St. Luke, ever let drop the faintest shadow of a hint that their words were figurative, not literal; that they meant symbols, not realities, and that language which seemed so plain was all the time an uncommon, an obscure, and an uncouth metaphor.

The Real Presence is the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church. It is the teaching of the Greek Church. It is the teaching of the Lutheran Church. It is denied by Calvinists.

In the Protestant Church the 'Order of Communion,' published in 1548, expressly upheld the Real Presence. In 1552 the twenty-ninth of the forty-two Articles expressly denied the Real Presence. In 1562, when the forty-two Articles were reduced to thirty-nine, this denial of the Real Presence was omitted from the Book of Common Prayer. Lastly, just a century later, in 1662, the Rubric against the Real Presence was restored, and Anglicans are now taught that to adore the consecrated Bread and Wine is idolatry,[1] and that Christ's Body is nowhere but in heaven. The teaching, therefore, of the Establishment is the teaching not of Luther, but of Calvin. High Anglicans, no doubt, believe in the Real Presence; but they so believe not because of, but in spite of, their own Church formularies. Moreover, they deny Transubstantiation, and thereby they deny implicitly the Real Presence.

[1] In a letter to a lady correspondent the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, wrote as follows (*Tablet*, January 6 1903, p. 64):

'MADAM,

'The bread used in the Holy Communion is certainly not God, either before consecration or after. And you must not worship it.

'Yours faithfully,

'F. CANTUAR.

'Precincts, Canterbury,
April 4, 1898.'

How appalling is the non-Catholic attitude of doubt or, at least, of indifference when confronted with Christ's magnificent pledge, when confronted with Christ's most terrible threat!

The pledge is: 'He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.'

The threat is: 'Verily, verily, I say unto you. Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, ye shall not have life in you.'

LECTURE VII

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

FROM Scripture alone we have proved that Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

'Truly' present, and not merely under a sign or symbol, as Zwingle and his followers asserted.

'Really' present: that is, objectively, and not merely subjectively; not merely in virtue of our faith, or our imagination, as Calvin and his followers asserted.

'Substantially' present, and not merely by His works or effects, as again Calvin and his school asserted.

The Man-God, Christ Jesus, living, whole, entire flesh and blood, body and soul, humanity and divinity, is as truly present under the appearances of bread and wine as He was truly present on the Cross on Calvary.

We have therefore demonstrated the 'fact' of the Real Presence. This 'fact' is a defined article of faith.

But the dogma of the Holy Eucharist deals not only with the 'fact,' but also with the 'mode' or

manner of effecting Christ's presence. Not the manner in which He is present, but the manner in which He is made to be present.

Under pain of heresy we are bound to believe not only that Christ is really present under the accidents of bread and wine, but also that the Real Presence is effected by Transubstantiation.

We must carefully distinguish between the *modus quo*—the manner *by which* Christ's Body is made to be present, the mode of change—and the *modus in quo*, the manner *in which* it is present, the mode of existence. What the latter may be the Church has not defined. But it is clear that in the Eucharist Christ's living Body exists in a quasi-spiritual fashion, impervious to the senses. You cannot see, or hear, or touch, or taste, or smell it.[1]

[1] On the mode of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, the following from the 'Catholic Dictionary' (*s.v.* 'Eucharist' (*d*) p. 316) will interest:

'The Council of Trent defines that Christ is contained whole and entire under either species—*i.e.*, that His Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity are given both under the form of bread and under that of wine. Where Christ's Body is there His Godhead must be also, because by the hypostatic union the Godhead became indissolubly united to human nature. Moreover, as Christ, having died once, lives for evermore, it follows that the human soul must needs be united to that risen and glorified Body which we receive in Communion. Hence Christ speaks of eating His flesh as equivalent to eating Him. Further, the same kind of reasoning certifies that Christ is given whole and entire under either kind. True, the force of the words of consecration puts the Body under the appearance of bread, the Blood under the appearance of wine; but Christ has no body except that glorified one united to His Blood—no

The word 'Transubstantiation' aptly and accurately expresses the conversion wrought by the words of consecration in the bread and wine. The word seals up and secures, in all its fulness, the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. It is a word which no artifice of man can distort, which no subtlety or sophistry can explain away. It is the great bulwark of the Blessed Sacrament.

The word 'Transubstantiation' is comparatively new, though the idea which it expresses is as old as Christianity. The doctrine which this word puts in a nutshell has been handed down from our Lord's time through the Apostles and their successors

---

blood except such as is united to His Body. Otherwise, Christ would be slain over again every time Mass is said ; for on each occasion the body would be separated from the blood. Again, the constant practice of the Church relieves us from any fear that this reasoning may be precarious. Since the Council of Constance it has been the general law in the West that all, except the celebrant, should communicate only under the species of bread ; and the Church, though it has changed its discipline in this matter, has by no means introduced a new principle. Infants, among the early Christians, received Communion under the one form of wine, and sick persons, solitaries, etc., under the one form of bread. The principle was fixed—viz., that Christ was given whole and entire under either species ; it was merely the application of this principle which varied.

'The Council of Trent goes on to say that the whole Christ is present under every separate part of each species. . . . Christ said of the divided host, "*This* is My Body. . . ."

'By the *spiritual* presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist it is not meant to deny that Christ's Body in the Eucharist is a real one (such a denial would be heresy), but just as all bodies

down to our own day. But the word itself came into common use in the eleventh century, in the controversy with the heresiarch Berengarius, and was formally and officially adopted by the Church on the Fourth Council of Lateran, in 1215.

We hear sometimes that Transubstantiation is a new doctrine, foisted by papal tyranny on a too credulous world. But that is untrue. Eight centuries ago—a fairly long time—it was not the doctrine that was new, nor the word that was new, but only the official use of the word. 'Transubstantiation' was adopted as an accurate word by theologians in the eleventh century to express a doctrine revealed by Christ in the first century. Like the word 'boycott,'

---

after the resurrection become spiritual, without ceasing to be bodies, because they have 'certain proprieties of spirit, so it is with Christ's Body in the Eucharist, only to a much wider extent and in a more wonderful way. At one and the same time Christ's Body is in heaven and on a thousand altars. As the spirit is present entire in the whole body, and in each part of it, so the Body of Christ, with all its substance and qualities, is present in each host, and in each part of the host. Consequently, the Eucharistic body of Christ is not extended in space—*i.e.*, one part of Christ's Body does not correspond to one particular part of the host. All this, of course, involves a series of stupendous miracles. It does not, however, imply any contradiction; and nothing (as we know) is impossible to God Almighty.'

These remarks we may supplement by pointing out that Christ's risen Body, during the forty days He sojourned upon earth from the Resurrection to the Ascension, was, except during a few hours, invisible and intangible, imperceptible to the senses. It was a spiritual Body—that is, it was a material Body divested of its material accidents—spiritualized.

introduced into English in our own time, 'Transubstantiation' is a new word to express an old idea. It is a neat word used to pin down an opponent from wriggling out of the truth. As, at the Council of Nice in 325, the dogmatic word 'Homoousion'—*i.e.*, 'Consubstantial'—was formally adopted against the heresiarch Arius to express and secure belief in the co-eternity and co-equality of the Son of God with His Eternal Father; as, at the Council of Ephesus in 431, the dogmatic word 'Theotocos'—*i.e.*, 'Mother of God'—was formally adopted against the heresiarch Nestorius to express and secure belief in the true doctrine of the Incarnation, that Jesus Christ, though He has both a human and a Divine nature, yet has not a human but only a Divine personality; so, in the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215, the dogmatic word 'Transubstantiation' was formally adopted against the heretical Albigenses to express and secure belief in the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.

Therefore these three words—Homoousion, Theotocos, Transubstantial—are tests and touchstones of orthodoxy.

Consequently, if the charge of novelty tells against the word 'Transubstantiation,' formally adopted in the thirteenth century, it tells with just the same force against the word 'Homoousion,' formally adopted in the fourth century, and against the word 'Theotocos,' formally adopted in the fifth century. And if the objection does not tell either against 'Homoousion' or 'Theotocos,' neither does it tell against 'Transubstantiation.'

I

In the dogma of the Holy Eucharist there are three points which are of Divine and Catholic faith, the denial of any one of which is a heresy. These three points are as follows:

First, that Christ is truly, really, and substantially present, under the appearances of bread and wine.

Secondly, that the substances are absent, but the accidents present, of bread and wine.

Thirdly, that this presence of Christ, and this absence of the substances of bread and wine, are effected by that particular substantial conversion called Transubstantiation.

II

In previous lectures we have proved the Real Presence. It now remains to prove Transubstantiation.

For the Real Presence and Transubstantiation do not of necessity stand or fall together. It is possible to admit a Real Presence and at the same time to deny Transubstantiation. But to admit Transubstantiation is of necessity to grant the Real Presence.

The various theories about the mode in which the Real Presence is effected may practically be reduced to three: Impanation, Consubstantiation, Transubstantiation. Of these three, the two former are false. The third is true.

III

First, then, Impanation is false.

Impanation is the theory of a Real Presence, first taught by the heresiarch Berengarius in the eleventh century, and condemned as heretical in the Sixth Council of Rome in 1079. It was revived in the sixteenth century by the German heretics, Osiander and his followers.

Impanation is the doctrine that in the Real Presence both the substances and accidents of bread and wine remain—that all the bread and wine remain unchanged—but are substantially united in a personal union with Christ; that, just as in the Incarnation God the Son assumed the nature of man and became man, so that the propositions are true, 'God is Man, Man is God': in like manner, in the Holy Eucharist, God the Son assumed the nature of bread and became bread, and assumed the nature of wine and became wine; so that the propositions are true, 'God is Bread, Bread is God; God is Wine, Wine is God.'

According to this grotesque teaching, there is in Christ only one person—the second Person of the Blessed Trinity—but four natures: the nature of God, the nature of man, the nature of bread, the nature of wine; so that Christ can say: 'I am God; I am Man; I am Bread; I am Wine.'

On this theory, when Jesus said, 'This is My Body,' He meant, 'This bread, *as* bread, is My Body.'

This foolish doctrine, however, explains nothing; for one nature of Christ cannot be predicated of another. It is false to say that the Divine nature of

Christ is His human nature. Consequently, even if our Lord had assumed, let us say, bread as a third nature, this nature of bread could be predicated neither of His Divine nor of His human nature. Thus, even if Impanation were true, the proposition, 'This bread, *as* bread, is My Body'—that is, 'This bread, as bread, is My human nature'—would be utterly false.

This absurd heresy is, however, obsolete, and therefore we need say no more about it.

IV

The second false theory is that of Consubstantiation.

It was taught by Luther and the Lutherans. For Luther held a Real Presence. The German monk confessed, indeed, that he had done his utmost to overthrow the Real Presence; for, as he observes:[1]

'I clearly saw how much I should thereby injure Popery. But I found myself caught without any way of escape. The text of the Gospel was too plain.'

To the day of his death the founder of Protestantism violently condemned those who denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Of Zwingle, who explained away the Eucharistic words into a metaphor, Luther said:

'The devil seems to have mocked those to whom the father of lies suggested so grotesque a heresy, and one so adverse to Scripture, as that of the Zwinglians.'

[1] 'Epist. ad. Argenten.,' vol. iv., p. 562, ed. Wittenb.

And against those who explained 'This is My Body' to mean 'This is a symbol of My Body' Luther contemptuously retorted that they might just as reasonably explain the first words of the Bible, 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth,' to mean, 'In the beginning the cuckoo ate the sparrow, feathers and all.'[1] Such interpreters of Scripture Luther, in his own peculiar style, declared to be 'indevilized and superdevilized.' He says:[2]

'They are a damned sect, lying heretics, bread-breakers, wine-bibbers, soul-destroyers.'

The apostate monk, in his eagerness 'to injure Popery,' could not deny the Real Presence. Therefore he did the next best thing for his purpose. He denied Transubstantiation, and substituted Consubstantiation.

V

What, then, is the meaning of Consubstantiation?

It is this: That in the Holy Eucharist the substances, as well as the accidents, of bread and wine remain after consecration, and that Christ's Body and Blood are really present *with*, or *in*, or *under* the substances of bread and wine. The living Christ is in the bread, like a piece of gold hidden in a loaf; is in the chalice, like a rich pearl hidden in a goblet of wine. Or, to vary the illustration, Christ is in the bread and wine, like electricity in a steel wire, or like fire in a red-hot bar.

Consubstantiation is, however, an indefensible theory.

[1] 'Defen. Verb. Dom.' [2] 'In. Par. Cat.'

Moreover, it is condemned by the Church as heretical.

It is indefensible. It is open to the difficulties urged against Transubstantiation, and to others besides. How can Christ's living Body be both in heaven and in the consecrated bread and wine? How can the Body of Christ—a full-grown man—be contracted to the dimensions of a morsel of bread and of a drop of wine? How can one and the same Body be in many churches at one and the same time? All these objections tell against the Consubstantiation of the Lutheran with at least as much force as they tell against the Transubstantiation of the Catholic.

Moreover, Consubstantiation is dead against the word of Scripture. For the Bible clearly teaches Transubstantiation, and therefore as clearly denies Consubstantiation. Our Lord took bread and declared that 'This is My Body,' and thereby He made an explicit affirmation and an explicit denial. He explicitly affirmed *this* to be His Body. He implicitly denied *this* to be bread. In the proposition, 'This is My Body,' the subject of the sentence *this*, when first uttered, and until defined by the utterance of the predicate 'My Body,' points out indefinitely that substance of bread which belongs to those accidents of bread, and which is about to be changed into Christ's Body. But as soon as the sentence is completed, the predicate 'My Body' determines the meaning of the subject *this*, and proves it to signify Christ's Body.

When the proposition is begun, '*this*' indefinitely means bread.

When the proposition is ended, '*this*' definitely means Christ's Body.

For, mark it well, the key of the whole position lies in this, that the words 'This is My Body' are operative, as well as declarative. They effect what they declare. They not only assert, they also cause, the absence of bread and the presence of Christ. They not only affirm, they also accomplish Transubstantiation.

And as these words of Christ clearly express Transubstantiation, so they just as clearly exclude Consubstantiation.

These words exclude Consubstantiation. Otherwise Christ's sentence, 'This is My Body,' would not be true. For as long as the substance of bread remains, the accidents of bread indicate that substance, and they indicate nothing else. Take an instance: Were I to hide a sovereign inside a loaf I might truly say, 'My gold piece is present *in* this bread, or *with* this bread, or *under* this bread.' But I could not truly say, pointing to the loaf, 'This is my sovereign.'

But against this explanation it has been objected that you might fairly point to a purse and say, 'This is money,' or to a wine-cask and say, 'This is wine.' Therefore to the bread enclosing Christ's Body and say, 'This is My Body.'

We reply that there is no parallelism between the two cases. For everyone knows that a purse is made to hold money, and a wine-cask to hold wine. But no one knows that bread is meant to hold Christ's Body, or that wine is meant to hold Christ's Blood.

Let us answer the objection in another way. Your soul is wholly in every part of your body—for example, in your forefinger. Could you, holding up your forefinger, truly say, 'This is my soul'? No one will say so.

If because His Body was merely present *in*, or *with*, or *under* the consecrated bread, Christ could say of the bread, 'This is My Body'; then, as God is present everywhere, and therefore is present *in*, or *with*, or *under* the bread before it is consecrated, you might hold up the unconsecrated bread and say, 'This is God.' These two propositions, the one concerning the consecrated bread, 'This is My Body,' the other concerning the unconsecrated bread, 'This is God,' would be either both true or both false. But the latter is certainly false. Therefore the former is certainly false.

VI

Let us now consider some analogous instances.

If, when at the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, our Lord changed water into wine, holding in His hand a cup of water, He had said in words that effected what they declared, 'This is wine,' would that have been Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation? Would the proposition have meant, in the Catholic sense, 'This, which was water, is now changed into wine'? or in the Lutheran sense, 'This water contains wine'?

Is it necessary to answer?

Take another parallel case.

If, when Aaron converted his rod into a serpent, holding the rod, he had said in words which wrought as well as declared the miracle, 'This is a serpent,' would the proposition have borne the Catholic signification, 'This, which was a rod, is now a serpent'? or the Lutheran signification, 'This is still a rod; but a serpent is lying hid in, with, or under the substance of the rod'?

Again, is it necessary to answer?

VII

If human language is the expression of thought, our Lord's completed words, as He held up the bread, 'This is My Body,' can mean neither Impanation—*i.e.*, 'This bread, *as* bread, is My Body'—nor Consubstantiation—*i.e.*, 'This bread contains My Body'—but only Transubstantiation —*i.e.*, 'This, which was bread, is now My Body.'

This doctrine of Transubstantiation is contained not only in the Bible, but also in the Apostolic Tradition; not, indeed, as a mere tradition, but as a tradition explanatory of the words of Christ. Jesus taught it to the Apostles. The Apostles taught it to their successors. It is found in the oldest Fathers. It is found in the most ancient liturgies. It is found in those Eastern sects which, in the earliest ages, split off from Catholic unity, yet preserved their belief in Transubstantiation. This striking fact alone, that Transubstantiation existed for centuries as universal belief, denied by none, is proof-positive that it is the doctrine of the Apostles themselves.

VIII

We are sometimes assured by opponents that Transubstantiation was invented in the ninth century.

Well, that is going a long way back! That makes it, at any rate, a thousand years old! That makes it seven centuries older than Protestantism!

But, let us ask, who in the ninth century invented it? Who introduced it? Who popularized it? Who persuaded all the clergy throughout the world to combine in one grand plot to teach it? How comes it that not a soul divulged the conspiracy? Why was there not a single dissentient voice? When precisely did they bring it in? Where are the records of the clamorous opposition with which mankind received it? How came the whole Christian world—Syrian, Greek, and Latin; Asiatic, African, and European—silently and complacently to accept a dogma so novel, so strange, so startling, and so hard to believe?

Yes, says the opponent, but how do you explain the difficulties against Transubstantiation? How can the accidents of bread and wine be without the substance of bread and wine? How can Christ's living Body exist under a speck of bread or under a drop of wine? How can one and the same Body exist in many places at one and the same time?

We answer, first, that all those who hold the Real Presence, but deny Transubstantiation, are met with exactly these same difficulties. This objection the upholder of Impanation, and the upholder of Con-

substantiation, must face just as much as must the Catholic who upholds Transubstantiation.

We answer, secondly, that this objection is not only a denial of Transubstantiation, it is also logically a denial of the miraculous altogether. And therefore it is an implicit denial of Christianity.

We answer, thirdly, that we cannot find, and do not pretend to find, natural explanations of these supernatural facts. And no wonder. For we do not know what matter is. We do not know what force is. We know something of the *relations* between matter and force; but what matter in itself may be, or what force in itself may be, we have not a ghost of an idea.[1] Nay, more; the man who affirms that matter is in itself incapable of the changes implied in the Real Presence and Transubstantiation is only proving his own unacquaintance with the subject under discussion. As Cardinal Newman wrote: 'That there is substance, every

[1] For instance, mass is measured by weight. And the same mass has always the same weight. Burn a pound of carbon, and the products of the combustion will still weigh a pound. But only relatively, not absolutely. That is, the pound of carbon will have the same attraction to the centre of the earth as the products of the combustion have. But that attraction is not the same at the top of a mountain as at the bottom of a coal-pit. While, therefore, it is true that the weight of a body is a measure of its mass, this constancy is nothing more than the constancy of a *relation*. The measure of mass is the reciprocal of the amount of acceleration produced in a body by a given force. The measure of force is the acceleration produced in a given mass. We know the relation of mass to force, but we know nothing of the terms related.

child knows; but what substance is, no one knows.'

Neither are these difficulties against the Holy Eucharist new. They are 2,000 years old. They were put to Christ Himself. Said the unbelieving Jews: 'How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat?' Yet Christ did not think fit to answer the sceptics. His silent argument was: 'I have said it; and I am God; and with God all things are possible.' God can do everything which is not a contradiction in terms. An opponent, therefore, who denies the Real Presence and Transubstantiation because he thinks them impossible must attempt to prove that these doctrines involve a contradiction in terms. And anyone who makes that attempt we can afford to watch with pitying amusement. Such a smatterer knows not the elements of logic. He displays ignorance of the elements of the question about which he dogmatizes. For twenty centuries intellects the most subtle, the most acute, the most vigorous, the most educated, have bowed in grateful acquiescence before the dogmas of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. Surely that is proof enough that though these doctrines are *above* reason, they are assuredly not *against* reason!

IX

And if some shallow person should decline to believe these doctrines simply because he does not understand them, I retort that even in the natural

order he believes a thousand things a day which he does not understand.

Does he understand, for example, how the shrivelled grain bursts into the green blade of corn? or how the corn passes into flesh and blood, into bone and muscle?

And in the supernatural order, does he understand Creation—how all things were made out of nothing?

Does he understand the Trinity—how numerically one and the same Divine Nature is in the three Divine Persons?

Does he understand the Incarnation—how two natures, the Human and the Divine, are in one and the same Divine Person?

If it is a difficulty how Christ's Body can, at the same time, be in many places, does he quite understand how those five loaves were at the same time in the hands of 5,000 men?[1]

[1] It is just as easy to conceive how a body can be at the same time in many places as to understand how two masses of matter can be at the same time in one and the same place.

That two bodies cannot occupy the same space was formerly held to be an obvious fact. How was it known? It was a fact perceived by our senses. Sir Isaac Newton said: 'That all bodies are impenetrable we gather, not from reason, but from sense.'*

Now, that fact is assuredly not gathered from 'sense.' Dalton, the father of the modern atomic theory, tells us that 'gases are mutually passive, and pass into each other as into vacua'—that is, two gases occupy at the same time the same space. 'No,' replies the atomic theorist; 'one gas passes into

* 'Phil. Nat. Princ. Math.,' Lib. III., reg. 3.

Does he quite understand how his own soul is at the same time wholly in each part of his body? Does he quite understand how the Almighty, how all the fiery energy of Divinity, how the Unspeakable

---

the interstices of the other.' Yes, but that is to assume the atomic theory—a large assumption indeed! And certainly the atomic theory is not gathered from 'sense.' As J. B. Stallo wrote: 'Whatever reality may correspond to the notion of the impenetrability of matter, this impenetrability is not, in the sense of the atomists, a datum of experience.'*

Lord Kelvin does not think with Newton. He writes:

'It has occurred to me that, without contravening anything we know from observation of nature' (that is, from 'sense'), 'we may simply deny the scholastic axiom that two portions of matter cannot jointly occupy the same space, and may assert, as an admissible hypothesis, that ether does occupy the same space as ponderable matter, and that ether is not displaced by ponderable bodies moving through space occupied by ether.'†

And on the question of the intrinsic impenetrability of matter, Cauchy expresses himself in these terms:

'If it pleased the Author of nature simply to modify the laws according to which the atoms attract or repel each other, we might instantly see the hardest bodies penetrating each other, the smallest particles of matter occupying immense spaces, or the largest masses reducing themselves to the smallest volumes, the entire universe concentrating itself, as it were, into a single point.'‡

The less we dogmatize as to what matter can or cannot do the safer shall we be. Christ has promised to give His one Body to be eaten in many separate places at once, and no one can show that this is impossible.

---

* 'Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics,' p. 90, 4th ed., London, 1900).

† 'Baltimore Lectures,' Appendix B., § 3, pp. 487, 488.

‡ 'Sept. Leçons de Physique Générale,' ed. Moigno, p. 38.

Deity, whose Name the Jews dared not pronounce, how Jehovah, Whom man cannot naturally look on and live, how this Infinite Being can, at the same time, be wholly in each wee petal of all the tiniest flowers that blow on every silent and out-of-the-way Alpine crag? If it is a difficulty how the one Body of Christ can possibly be at the same time in two places, does he quite understand how two bodies can at the same time be in one place? Yet that miracle happened when our Lord's Body passed through the wood of the closed doors of that Jerusalem chamber wherein the disciples sat (John xx. 19). If it is a difficulty how Christ's Eucharistic Body can be without weight, does he quite understand how that same Body walked on the Sea of Galilee and, as if weightless, sank not? If a Bible Christian will not believe Transubstantiation because he cannot understand it, why does he believe that Christ at Cana in Galilee changed water into wine? Or that Moses in Egypt changed whole rivers into blood? Or that Aaron before Pharaoh changed his staff into a serpent? Why does he believe these miracles, since assuredly he does not understand them?

X

But, urges the sceptic, if we cannot trust our senses, we can trust nothing. And yet our senses tell us that the Sacred Host is only bread. With a microscope we can see the bread.

We reply that the objection is baseless. Your

senses tell you that the Consecrated Host is only bread? But which do you mean, the substance of bread, or the accidents of bread? If you mean the substance, you are talking nonsense! Your senses —with or without a microscope—know nothing, and can know nothing, of substance. If you mean the accidents of bread, your senses do not deceive you, since the accidents of bread are really there.

The question, of course, is one not of the senses, but of the intellect. And the intellect believes because it is enlightened by God.

XI

The miracles, then, of the Eucharist we cannot naturally explain. But neither can an opponent explain them away.

The evidence on which we believe these dogmas is not natural, but supernatural. The possibility of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation is, therefore, for Christians wholly a question of fact. Transubstantiation might be possible without at the same time being a fact. But it cannot be a fact without at the same time being possible. Now, from the Bible, we have proved the fact. Therefore from the Bible we have proved the possibility of the fact. The sceptic says that Transubstantiation is impossible, and thus it cannot be a fact. God says that Transubstantiation is a fact, and thus it cannot be impossible. For God is all-wise, and therefore cannot be deceived. God is all-truthful, and there-

fore cannot deceive. God is all-powerful, and therefore can execute whatever He designs.

The sceptic boasts that he will not believe unless he sees.

Christ answers: 'Blessed are ye who have not seen and yet have believed.'

LECTURE VIII

WHAT TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS

WHAT is meant precisely by the word Transubstantiation?

Transubstantiation may be defined as the conversion of the whole substance of bread into Christ's Body, and of the whole substance of wine into Christ's Blood, the accidents of bread and wine remaining.

But this definition bristles with technical terms—conversion, substance, accidents. Let us try to explain them.

I

To clear the ground, first of all, in a popular fashion, let us ask what is understood by 'substance'; what is understood by 'accidents'?

Every material thing is made up of substance and accidents.

Substance is the permanent element in a thing. As long as a thing remains this thing, its substance remains.

Accidents are the variable elements in a thing.

Substance underlies accidents. Accidents inhere in substance.

Substance stands by itself, and needs no substratum to support it. An accident is that which cannot naturally stand by itself, but requires substance as its support or substratum.

Substance, as such, we cannot know by the senses. We can neither see it, nor hear it, nor touch it, nor taste it, nor smell it.

Accidents are all that by our five senses we know of a material thing.

Substance, as such, can be without accidents. But accidents cannot *naturally* be without substance.

Substance, as such, can (I repeat) be without accidents. For God is a substance, and not only God has no accidents, but He cannot have them. If He could, He would be capable of change; and thus would not be infinite; and therefore would not be God. That Divine Substance which is God has, and can have, no material accidents—such as size, scent, weight, colour, taste; and no spiritual accidents, such as changes in His Intellect, or in His Will. Therefore, not only can there be Substance without accidents; but in one case, at least—God—there is a substance which is incapable of accidents. 'Substance,' then, does not, in its essential notion, connote or imply 'accident.'

But, though substance can be without accidents, accidents cannot, naturally and of their own nature, be without substance. By definition, an accident is a being naturally requiring to exist in substance.[1] We

[1] Hence accident is called, not 'being'—*i.e.*, not *ens*; but being of being'—*i.e.*, *ens entis*.

say of a material thing, 'it is heavy; it is brown; it is sweet; it is hard,' and so forth. The 'it' is substance. The weight, brownness, sweetness, hardness, etc., are accidents, or modifications of this substance. The 'it'—*i.e.*, the substance—may remain when these particular accidents are changed into others. Take an illustration:

Take, as an instance, a block of ice. It is a certain substance with certain accidents which you recognise at a glance. The ice is solid, heavy, hard, cold, glittering, transparent. Next melt it. It remains the same substance, yet the accidents—how changed they are! It is now liquid, clear, cool, yielding to the touch. Next turn it into steam. It still remains the same substance; yet, once again, how changed are the accidents! It is now an invisible gas, superheated, exerting great pressure. Next let it escape from the boiler of the locomotive, and in a moment it passes into vapour. Still it is the same substance, but again the accidents are changed. It is visible, white, cloudy.

Now, all through these changes, how do we know that ice, water, steam, and vapour are all one and the same substance? Not by the five senses, or by any one of them; not by touch, or taste, or sight, or hearing, or smell. The testimonies of the senses are, in the three cases, utterly different; yet the substance is one and the same. How do we know? By the intellect alone.

Take another illustration. If we run a current of electricity through a jar of water by electrolysis, we can decompose the substance water into two other

different and distinct substances—into oxygen gas and hydrogen gas. The accidents change, as is obvious to the senses. But does the substance remain? It does not. The substance of water is not the substance of either oxygen or hydrogen. The substance of water has been changed into two other substances—oxygen and hydrogen. How do we know? By the intellect alone.

The senses, then, cannot know substance. False philosophers have denied the existence of substance. But no philosophy has taught that the senses can know substance.

II

Again, in the definition of Transubstantiation occurs the technical word 'conversion.'

What, then, is 'conversion'?

Conversion is a particular form of change. And by change we mean alteration. Every conversion is a change; but not every change is a conversion. Conversion is a specific form of change.

For conversion, in the generic and widest sense, may include creation and annihilation. For creation is the change, the transition from nothing into something. Annihilation is the change, the transition from something into nothing. Only God can create or annihilate; and therefore, in popular language, we do not use the word 'change' in this widest and philosophic sense.

But 'conversion,' or 'change,' as commonly understood, means transition from some one thing

into some other thing. Conversion is the passing of one thing into another thing.

It is obvious, therefore, that conversion may be accidental, or substantial, or both.

Conversion is only accidental—*i.e*, is only change of accidents—when the substance remains, but the accidents change. For instance, conversion is only accidental when cold water becomes hot, or corn becomes flour, or a peasant becomes a prince, or a mendicant becomes a millionaire. Such accidental conversion might perhaps be called 'Transaccidentation,' or the transition from one set of accidents to another and a different set of accidents. When our Lord's appearance entirely changed on Mount Thabor, for 'the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistening' (Luke ix. 29), that was a particular form of accidental conversion to which we give a special name. In that case Transaccidentation is called Transfiguration.

So much for accidental conversion.

But conversion may also be substantial.

Conversion is called substantial conversion when one substance is changed into another; for instance, when wheat is changed into flesh; when flesh is changed into worms; when water is changed into oxygen and hydrogen.

Moreover, substantial conversion may be either partial or complete conversion—*i.e.*, of the whole of the substance, as substance, or only of one element or factor of the substance. For substance has two parts, two elements, two factors—matter and form. To understand this let us take some material sub-

stance—wheat, for instance—and mentally abstract from its sensible qualities. Think of the substance of wheat apart from its weight, its colour, its taste, its smell, and its other accidents. That residuum, unknowable by the senses, but known by the intellect, that comparatively permanent thing we call 'substance,' is itself made up of two component parts—the matter and the form. The matter is the determinable part, the form is the determining part, of a thing. The form is that which makes matter to be *this* thing; makes wheat to be wheat.

Hence form is not the same as shape. The 'form' of clay, for instance, is that which makes this portion of matter to be clay, quite apart from the shape of the clay. An angel has form; a human soul has form; but neither has shape.

Form, again, is the principle of action; not, indeed, the proximate principle, but the remote; it is the first primary root of all natural energy.

Moreover, matter is indestructible, but forms come and go. Take an example. Run a current of electricity through water, and the form of water—the aquacity—disappears, and gives place to the forms of oxygen and hydrogen. But the matter which went to make up water is the same matter which makes up oxygen and hydrogen. It is the same matter, but different substances. For matter is determined to be this particular substance by this particular form.

III

Naturally speaking, the forces of Nature can effect only a *partial* conversion. A *complete* conversion they can not bring about. Natural forces can change the form; the substratum, the matter, they cannot change. This change of the form which makes this portion of matter to be this substance—say, a rose—might be called transformation. For instance, the digestive organs of a human being can transform bread into flesh, and blood, and muscle, and bone. And in this particular instance of transformation, the substantial form of bread is transformed into the substantial forms of flesh, of blood, of muscle, and of bone. But the matter which constituted one element of the bread is the same matter which also constitutes one element of flesh, one element of blood, one element of muscle, one element of bone.

A *complete* conversion can only be effected by supernatural agency. It transcends the power of natural forces. A complete conversion is the change not only of one substantial form into another substantial form, but also of this parcel of matter into another and different parcel of matter.

A complete conversion is thus the change of the whole of one substance into the whole of another substance; of the matter and form of one substance into a different matter and a different form of another substance.

A complete substantial conversion is called by the technical name, 'Transubstantiation.'

Here, perhaps, the objection might be urged that

this cumbrous word is not needed, since the conversion in question is nothing more than annihilation and creation. For when in the Holy Eucharist bread passes into Christ's Body, and wine passes into Christ's Blood, are not the substances of bread and wine annihilated, and the substances of Christ's Body and Blood created in their place ?

No, that is not so. Transubstantiation is the accurate word for a conversion which is neither annihilation nor creation.

Annihilation is the transition from something into nothing, from a positive term into a negative term. Creation is the transition from nothing into something, from a negative term into a positive term. But in the Holy Eucharist Transubstantiation is the transition from a positive term into a positive term, from something into something, from Bread into Christ's Body, and from wine into Christ's Blood.

Moreover, in the Eucharistic Transubstantiation there is this additional reason why the change in question is neither annihilation nor creation, but a real conversion—viz., that the accidents of the term changed remain as accidents in the term produced. The accidents of bread remain ; the accidents of wine remain. The accidents which inhered in the bread and wine remain in the Holy Eucharist, not indeed inherent in Christ's living Body, but supported in being by Divine Omnipotence. The power of God supports them in existence, just as, before the consecration, the bread and wine had supported them in existence.

Let us repeat that by Transubstantiation in the

Blessed Sacrament we understand not the mode or manner *in which* Christ exists in the Holy Eucharist, but the mode or manner *by which* He is made to exist in the Holy Eucharist. Transubstantiation is not a mode of existence, it is a mode of conversion. This mode *by which*—Transubstantiation—is a defined article of the Catholic faith. The mode *in which*—the manner of Christ's existence in the Eucharist—the Church has never defined.[1]

[1] As to the manner of Christ's existence in the Holy Eucharist, the two following quotations—one from Cardinal Manning, the other from Cardinal Newman—will not be uninteresting.

In Purcell's 'Life of Manning,' vol. ii., p. 31, 'Letter to Archdeacon Wilberforce,' we have these headings :

'1. The Council of Trent says that our Lord's Humanity—*secundum naturalem existendi modum—i.e.*, in its proper dimensions, etc.—is at the right hand of God only.

'2. The Church, therefore, distinguishes *natural* presence from supernatural or *sacramental* presence. Of the modes of this *sacramental* presence it defines nothing. It is supernatural.

'3. This presence being *supernatural,* is not a subject of natural criteria, or natural operations.

'4. Within the sphere of natural phenomena and effects there is no change in the consecrated elements. But a change does take place in a sphere into which no natural criteria, such as sense, can penetrate. Of this we are assured by the voice of revelation, *Hoc est corpus meum*, etc. The Church is concerned only to affirm this supernatural fact ; as Vasquez says, *ut sint vera Christi verba.* Beyond this affirmation the Church affirms nothing.

'5. The Church has no jurisdiction in science or philosophy. The office of the Church is Divine inerrancy within the sphere of the original revelation. But ontology and metaphysics are no part of it. There are many philosophies about *matter* and

substance, etc.; but none is authoritative. They are many because no one has been defined.'

Cardinal Newman* wrote thus:

'The Catholic doctrine is as follows. Our Lord is *in loco*—in heaven; not in the same sense in the Sacrament. He is present in the Sacrament only in substance—*substantive*—and substance does not require or imply the occupation of place. But if place is excluded from the idea of the Sacramental Presence, therefore division or distance from heaven is excluded also, for distance implies a measurable interval, and such there cannot be except between places. Moreover, if the idea of distance is excluded, therefore is the idea of motion.

'Our Lord, then, neither descends from heaven upon our altars, nor moves when carried in procession. The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how; we have no parallel to the "how" in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but *sacramentally*. His presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental, an absolute mystery, not against reason, however, but against imagination, and must be received by faith.'

---

* 'Via Media,' ed. 1877, vol. ii., p. 221.

LECTURE IX

LEIBNITZ ON THE EUCHARIST

GOTTFRIED WILHELM LEIBNITZ, born in 1646, at Leipzig, is one of the greatest names of the modern world. He was 'almost equally distinguished as philosopher, as mathematician, and as man of affairs.'[1] As a philosopher he wrote the 'Monadologie,' a metaphysical study, the influence of which on European thought can hardly be overestimated. As a theologian he wrote the 'Théodicée,' a profound and original treatise on the goodness of God, human liberty, and the origin of evil. As a mathematician, he discovered the Differential Calculus, and as an original genius in this branch of knowledge he has seldom been equalled and never surpassed.[2]

Now Leibnitz, though a Protestant, had made a special study of the doctrines concerning the

[1] 'Encyclop. Brit.,' *s.v.* Leibnitz.

[2] 'Authorities seem generally agreed that Leibnitz discovered the Differential Calculus independently of any knowledge of Newton's method of fluxions; so that each of these great men in reality attained the same result for himself' (Blackie's 'Modern Cyclopædia,' vol. v., p. 241, *s.v.* Leibnitz).

Eucharist, and was, therefore, most competent to offer an opinion on this profound and difficult subject.

What, then, was that opinion?

We propose now to give his own words on this subject, and thus to leave him to speak for himself.

I

First of all, Leibnitz holds that the Mass is a Sacrifice.

'Whether the Sacrament of the Altar, or the Eucharist be a Sacrifice? In deciding which, it is to be observed that there exists no dispute between us and the Roman Catholics as to whether the Eucharist can be *called* a Sacrifice, which is admitted on both sides, but whether it *be* a Sacrifice, properly or improperly so-called . . .'

Catholics say that 'in the Eucharist numerically the same Sacrifice which was delivered up for us, and numerically the same blood which was shed for us, are really—nay, most really—present, and are given and drunk by the communicants; not in faith merely, but by the mouth of the body, though not in a carnal or Capharnaitic way, but still truly; and thus, under this title also, the Eucharist merits the name of a Sacrifice properly so-called.

'Now, according to this definition of the Romanists, Protestants might allow the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice properly so-called. . . .

'It s plainer than the noonday that the debate

does not regard the matter itself, but merely the words, and that both parties are agreed in this—namely, that Christ is not slain anew in the Eucharist, but that He is present therein notwithstanding, and that His Body is truly eaten; that thus there is instituted a commemoration or representation of the Sacrifice which was once offered for us on the Cross, but which cannot be again offered *in the same manner*. . . .

'Let me add . . . that St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Cyprian have not hesitated to call the Eucharist, the one, "*a most true and singular Sacrifice*,"[1] the other, "*a sacrifice full of God, to be revered, tremendous and most sacred.*"[2] And St. Gregory of Nyssa says expressly, in his "First Sermon upon the Resurrection of Christ,"[3] "By a mysterious kind of Sacrifice which cannot be discerned by man, He offers Himself a host for us, and immolates the Victim, being at once in His own person, the Priest and that Lamb of God Who taketh away the sins of the world. But when did He perform this? When He gave His Body to be eaten, and His Blood to be drunk, by the assembled disciples, then He openly declared that the Sacrifice of the Lamb was accomplished; for the body of the victim is not yet to be eaten if it have life in it. Wherefore when He gave His Body to be eaten and His Blood to be drunk by His disciples, the Body was immolated in a secret and invisible way, as it pleased the power of Him Who

[1] 'Catech.,' xxiii., pp. 327, 328, Benedictine ed.

[2] 'Epist.,' lxiii., p. 192, Oxford Trans.

[3] Orat., i., 'De Res. Ch.,' tom. ii., pp. 821, 822, Paris, 1615.

was accomplishing Sacrifices upon the mystery of Himself." '

St. Jerome says: 'The oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught should be offered over the universal world, has been reputed a pure Sacrifice by God, and is acceptable to Him. There are offerings in the Old Covenant, and offerings in the New—sacrifices among the people—sacrifices in the Church; but the kind only is changed, since it is offered now not by slaves, but by freemen.'[1]

St. Augustine said: 'Instead of all the Sacrifices and oblations' (meaning of the Old Testament), 'now in the New Testament, His *Body* is offered, and administered to those partaking of it.'

The Second Council of Nice says:[2] 'Nowhere has the Lord, nowhere have the Apostles, called the Unbloody Sacrifice an image, but called it the Body itself, and the Blood itself.'

Nicholas Cabasilas, in the 'Explanation of the Liturgy' (chap. xxxii.), writes: 'It is not the figure of a sacrifice, nor the image of blood; but real immolation, and real Sacrifice.'

'If Protestants were satisfied henceforward to speak thus, in unison with the holy Fathers, I do not see anything remaining which should retard peace, as far as this point is concerned.'[3]

[1] Lib. iv., p. 362, Paris, 1575, Benedictine ed., ch. xviii., p. 250.

[2] Act vi., Hardouin's 'Concilia,' iv. 323.

[3] 'System of Theology,' by Leibnitz, translated by Dr. Russell, London, 1850. 'Private Thoughts upon the Method of Re-uniting the Churches,' pp. 184-187.

II

Next, it is evident that Leibnitz fully admitted, and defended, the doctrine of the Real Presence. He says:[1]

'I come to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, upon which the greater weight of the controversy' (concerning reunion of the Churches) 'has turned. For there are some persons who, reasoning too freely in judging of the Divine Mysteries, and perverting certain words of Chrysostom, Augustine, and others among the ancients, maintain that the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Lord's Supper, but are only represented or signified; because (they say) Christ's Body is as far removed from us as heaven is from earth, and a thing which possesses the true nature of a body cannot be in more than one place simultaneously.'

'Some, with greater liberality, appear to admit (though not without ambiguity) that we really receive the Body of Christ, but receive it through the medium of the mind which is raised up to heaven by faith; and that consequently, as faith alone is the instrument of receiving, the Sacrament is not received by the unworthy.

'This doctrine seems entirely opposed to the words of the Apostle. However, this opinion, when its supporters are driven to an explanation, seems, in the end, simply to amount to this, that the mind flies up to heaven to receive the Body of Christ, only in the same way as we are said to be, in thought, at

[1] 'System of Theology,' *apud* Russell, p. 98.

Rome or Constantinople; for, if they adopt any other explanation, they will be compelled to ascribe to our mind a power which they deny to Christ's Body—viz., that of being in heaven and on earth at the same time.

'We shall be more secure, however, in adhering closely to the words of the Saviour, who, when He had taken bread and wine, said, "*This is My Body.*"

'Pious antiquity always recognised in this Sacrament a great mystery beyond the comprehension of the human mind; *but if it be a sign that is given and not a reality, there is no mystery in it whatsoever.* And indeed, that every existing Church in the entire world—with the exception of the Reformed Churches, and those that have sunk lower than the Reformers in innovation—admit the Real Presence of Christ's Body, certain recent writers of eminence[1] have demonstrated with such overwhelming evidence that we must either admit this to be proven or abandon all hope that anything shall ever be proved regarding the opinions of distant nations.'

III

Leibnitz, then, upheld the doctrine of the Real Presence. Moreover, he set aside the objection that, extension being of the essence of body, Christ's Body could not be contained under a speck of bread or a drop of wine, for he denied that extension is of the essence of body. He says:[2]

[1] The authors of the 'Perpétuité de la Foi,' Paris, 1669.

[2] 'System of Theology,' p. 99.

'It is true that if it could be proved, by irresistible arguments involving a metaphysical necessity, that the whole essence of a body consists in extension, or the filling a determinate space—in that case, as truth can never be opposed to truth, it would follow as a necessary consequence that, even by Divine power, one body could no more be in many places simultaneously than the diagonal can be commensurable with the side of a square. And if this were ascertained it would, unquestionably, be necessary to recur to an allegorical interpretation of the Divine word, whether written or traditionary.

'But so far is it from being true that any of the philosophers has perfected this vaunted demonstration that, on the contrary, it rather appears capable of solid proof that though the nature of a body requires that it should be extended—*unless an obstacle to its extension be interposed by God*—nevertheless the essence of a body consists in matter and substantial form—that is, in the principle of action and of passion—for it is the essence of a substance to be capable of acting and suffering. Matter, therefore, is the first passive power, and substantial form is the first act, or the first active power. And though it is true that the natural order of things requires these to be defined by a place of determinate magnitude, yet there is no absolute necessity which requires it.'

In that passage the great mathematician lays it down that the essence of body is 'matter' and 'form,' and that 'extension' is but a separable

accident of matter.[1] In several other places Leibnitz made the same assertion. Take two instances:

'Descartes endeavours to show that a body consists in extension alone. To prove this, he enumerates all the other attributes, and shows that body does not consist in any of them. But he has to prove that his enumeration is complete. Moreover, he does not disprove it satisfactorily even for all those attributes which he has enumerated.'[2]

And again he says:

'That extension constitutes the common nature of corporeal substances, I have seen very confidently asserted by many, but I have never seen it proved.'[3]

IV

After this, Leibnitz affirms Transubstantiation:

'There are some who, while they admit the Real

[1] What Leibnitz held by the light of reason, we Christians know also by the light of revelation. In the Holy Eucharist the accidents of bread are separated from the substance of bread; the accidents of wine are separated from the substance of wine; the accidents of Christ's Body are separated from the substance of Christ's Body. These accidents—as God has revealed—are *separated* from the essence of body, and therefore they are separable, for *ab esse ad posse valet illatio—i.e.*, the inference is true from existence to possibility. In other words, a thing might be possible yet not exist; still, if it exist, it must be possible. The accidents of body are separable from body, but only Divine efficiency can bring out the separation. That effect transcends the power of natural causes.

[2] 'Leibnitzeus ungedruckte Anmerkungen zu Descartes, p. 45, *apud* Russell, p. 100, note 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 39, *apud* Russell, p. 100.

Presence, maintain a sort of Impanation.[1] They say that the Body of Christ is given in, with, and under the bread.

'Hence, when Christ said, "*This is My Body*," they understand it in the same sense as if a person were to exhibit a purse and to say, "*This is money*."

'The records of pious antiquity, however, plainly enough demonstrate that the bread is changed into the Body, and the wine into the Blood, of Christ.

'The ancients, too, universally acknowledged therein a change of substance which the Latins have aptly rendered "Transubstantiation." And it has been defined that the whole substance of the bread and wine is changed into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. And therefore, here as elsewhere, the Scripture is to be explained from the tradition which the Church, its keeper, has transmitted to us.'[2]

V

And not only does Liebnitz hold to Transubstantiation; but he goes further, and contends that if there be a Real Presence at all, it can be effected only by Transubstantiation. Nay, he points out that not only is Transubstantiation not opposed to the Protestant Confession of Augsburg, but, on the contrary, is a necessary inference from that Confession. He writes:

'Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence simultaneously in many places, do not, in their ultimate

[1] He means Consubstantiation.

[2] 'System of Theology,' pp. 100-105.

analysis, differ from each other. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive a body present in several separate places, at one and the same time, in any other way than by conceiving its substance to exist under different species.

'For substance alone is not subject to its extension. Therefore . . . neither is it subject to the conditions of place.

'Hence, Transubstantiation, as it is called, in well-considered phrase, by the Council of Trent . . . is not opposed to the Confession of Augsburg. Nay, on the contrary, it follows from it.

'In a word, the only question between Catholics and Protestants is this, whether the Real Presence—or Transubstantiation, for I shall show them to be mutually contained in each other—is instantaneous, and continues only in the moment of use, or of communion—as the Augsburg Confession teaches—or whether it commences at the time of consecration, and endures till the corruption of the species—as is taught by the Church of Rome.'[1]

VI

Then Leibnitz points out that, as the words of consecration effect no change that can be perceived by the senses, the bread and wine, after being changed into Christ's Body and Blood, are still called bread and wine. He writes:

'Oftentimes, as they are not distinguishable by the

[1] 'Briefwechsel zwischen Leibnitz, Arnauld, und Ernst von Hesse-Rheinfels,' pp. 145, 146.

senses, the name of bread and wine is applied to the remaining species.[1] Thus St. Ambrose declares the Word of the Lord to be so efficacious that "they at once are what they were, and yet are changed into another thing";[2]—that is, the accidents are what they were, the substance is changed—for the same Father says that after consecration they are not to be believed to be anything else but the Body and Blood of Christ.

'And the Roman Pontiff Gelasius insinuates that "the bread is changed into the Body, while the nature of the bread remains"—that is to say, its qualities or accidents remain—for in those times the forms of speech were not measured in strict accordance with metaphysical notions.

'It was in this sense also that Theodoret said that, in this conversion—which he himself calls a change (*μεταβολήν*)—the mystic symbols are not divested of their proper nature.'[3]

We may add that the use of this word, *μεταβολή*, by Theodoret, is here a decisive argument. For this Father always used the word to mean a real and substantial change. For instance, he calls it 'change'—*i.e.*, *μεταβολή*—when the rod of Moses was transmuted into a serpent; when the waters of the Nile were transmuted into blood; when the water at the

[1] That is, the name of bread and wine is applied to those remaining species, or accidents, or appearances, of bread and wine which remain after the substances of bread and wine have passed into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood.

[2] 'Ambrosii Opera,' Benedictine ed., tom. ii., p. 369.

[3] 'System of Theology,' pp. 106-109.

marriage-feast of Cana in Galilee was transmuted into wine; when one colour was transmuted into another.[1]

VII

We have pointed out in a previous lecture that the accidents of bread and wine after consecration do not inhere in Christ's Body and Blood as before consecration they had inhered in the substances of bread and wine. The substances of bread and wine had been the *material* causes, the *substrata*, of the accidents of bread and wine; the Body and Blood of Christ are *not* the material causes, are not the *substrata*, of the accidents of bread and wine. The accidents of bread and wine are not radicated in Christ's Body and Blood, but are kept in existence by the *efficient* act of God.

This truth, too, Leibnitz clearly grasped. He wrote:

'Nor do the accidents subsist in the Body of Christ as in a subject. Indeed, they are not sustained in any subject. . . . For if the accidents which belonged to the bread could be predicated of Christ's Body, it would follow that Christ's Body was a fragile, slender, white thing. It would follow, too, that this small white thing—in a word, this thing which has all the sensible properties of bread—was the object of adoration, and that all the indignities which may be offered to the species, or may accidentally befall the species, occur to the Body of Christ itself.'[2]

[1] *Cf.* Waterworth's 'Faith of Catholics,' ii., p. 366.

[2] 'System of Theology,' p. 109.

VIII

Moreover, Leibnitz perceived that Transubstantiation was wrought at the time, and by the very act, of consecration. He says:

'It is certain that it was the doctrine of the ancients, as appears from the words of Ambrose just cited, that the conversion is wrought by the very act of consecration. Nor did any of the ancients ever hear of the novel opinion, held by some nowadays, that the Body of Christ becomes present only in the moment of Communion. For there are well-ascertained instances of persons not consuming this sacred food immediately on receiving it, but sending it to others, and carrying it to their houses—nay, even upon journeys and into deserts—and this custom, though it was afterwards abolished for greater reverence, was at one time approved.

'And, indeed, either we must hold (which Heaven forbid!) that the words of institution, as pronounced by the priest, are false, or we are compelled to admit that what is blessed by him is the Body of Christ, even before It is eaten.

'Not to mention the difficulties in which the defenders of this opinion embarrass themselves as to whether the conversion first commences on the lips, or in the mouth, or in the throat, or in the stomach, or, indeed, whether it take place even there, if through any defect of the organs of digestion, the symbols (*i.e.*, accidents) are not consumed.'[1]

[1] 'System of Theology,' pp. 109, 110.

IX

Under this heading we may throw together some passages further elucidating the views which Leibnitz held and publicly defended concerning Transubstantiation, and especially that this doctrine involved no contradiction in terms, and thus was not intrinsically impossible. He maintained that the Real Presence, effected by Transubstantiation, was not only possible, but was also a fact.

He writes:[1] 'In revealed theology I undertake to demonstrate against the insults of infidels and atheists, not indeed the truth of mysteries (since that comes from revelation), but their *possibility*, so as to vindicate them from all contradictions. . . .

'And to advert especially to the Real Presence in the Eucharist against those who hold that it is but a sign, it is true that Arnauld has sufficiently established the reality of the Presence, against Claude, from the perpetual tradition of the ancients; but all will be in vain unless their single weapon of *impossibility* and *contradiction* be wrested from the hands of these Hercules. For they persist that it is a thing impossible, contradictory, and revolting all reason: and that, therefore, it must necessarily be understood figuratively, like the prepositions, "Herod is a wolf," "the lamb is a Passover." Yes, though a thousand passages of Fathers and Scripture were

[1] 'Brief an den Herzog von Hannover, Johann Friedrich. Leibnitz, Deutsche Schriften, herausgegeben von Guhrauer,' bk i., pp. 282, 283. Translated by Russell, 'System of Theology,' p. 110, note 1.

produced, this reply will still remain free to them.

'And they are confirmed in this by the philosophy of the day, as amended by Galileo, Bacon, Gassendi, Descartes, Hobbes, etc. For this philosophy is received with universal applause by all the *curiosi*, because it explains all the properties of bodies mechanically—by the notions of magnitude, figure, and motion—without supposing imaginary beings. . . .

'Now, by profound examination, I have at last so far succeeded, that I am confident I can demonstrate, consistently with the improved philosophy, the possibility of the Eucharist, as it is explained in the Council of Trent.'

Again, in another place, Leibnitz distinguishes between matter and extension, or what he calls 'substance' and 'mass.' He writes:[1]

'I will show that, by virtue of the principles of the improved philosophy, there must be in every body an ultimate, incorporeal, substantial principle, distinct from mass; and that it was this the ancients and the scholastics called *substance*.'

He enunciates the same view in another passage even yet more clearly:[2]

'It is *evident* that a substance is really distinguished from its modifications or accidents, contrary to what is held by certain writers, and especially the late Duke of Buckingham, who discusses this question in his lately-printed pamphlet on religion.'

In a letter to Arnauld, Leibnitz drew the same

[1] Leibnitz's 'Deutsche Schriften,' i., p. 283.

[2] 'Opera,' i., p. 145.

distinction and deduced therefrom the inference that by Divine power a material substance could exist without accidents, and material accidents could exist without substance; and the same substance could be in different places at one and the same time. He writes:[1]

'It appears very plainly in what the substance differs from the species. And a reason has been discovered which makes it perfectly comprehensible that God can cause the substance of the same body to be at the time in several places distant from each other, or, what comes to the same thing, to exist under several different species.'

And in a letter to the Duke of Hanover, Leibnitz made similar assertions. He wrote:[2]

'I will further show that this principle may exist in many places at the same time—nay, under far distant and distinct species. Thus, the possibility, not only of the Real Presence, but also of Transubstantiation . . . is made evident.'

In another, and most interesting, utterance Leibnitz states these opinions somewhat more elaborately and at greater length. He writes:[3]

'We must know . . . whether it is not reasonable to follow here the literal interpretation of the Bible (if it is possible), in order not to open the door to the Socinians; especially as the Church has always believed in a real receiving—as all the Oriental Churches believe to the present day.

[1] 'Briefwechsel,' p. 145.

[2] 'Deutsche Schriften,' i., pp. 283, 284.

[3] 'Opera,' i., pp. 30, 31.

'The only thing which could exempt us from the obligation of adhering to the letter of the Testament of Jesus Christ would be an absurdity or impossibility in the literal sense thereof. This, therefore, it remains to examine.

'Let us, then, examine the nature of a body.

'Many persons lay it down that they know but two attributes—thought and extension—and assert that thought constitutes a spirit, and that extension constitutes a body. If this were the case, it would be quite certain that it implied a contradiction to say that a body, or its substance, was united immediately to any other distant substance. But it would also follow that God could not cause bodies to act *in distans*, nor to pass through another body, which appears a bold assertion, the more especially as it rests on a purely precarious or arbitrary hypothesis. For it is not true, it has not been proved, it is even directly at issue with the opinions of the ancient philosophy, that the nature of a body consists in extension.

'It is easy to show that, by the notion of extension alone, we could not explain either impetus, or the laws of motion, or the natural inertia of a body, or several other phenomena.

'Far from extension being anything primitive in a body, we see clearly that the notion of it is resolvable into others and includes those of multitude, continuity, diffusion; that thus extension is a relation and supposes something which might be multiplied, resolved, diffused, or extended; as the extension of the colour, of the weight, of the

resistance. Thus it is in this that the essence or primitive constitution of a body consists.

'Now that which is continued and repeated in a body is, properly speaking, the resistance without which there would not be a body, but merely a vacant space incapable of change.

'Thus, to return to the ancient and true opinion, the essence of a body consists in the primitive power of suffering and acting' (*passio* and *actio*); 'in passiveness and activeness; or, in one word, of resistance. Primitive passiveness is what I call "form"; or what Aristotle calls "entelecheia prima." Experience shows that bodies possess activity and resistance. Consequently, those who make them consist in extension alone are driven to deprive them of all action, and to say that it is God alone who acts—a strange opinion, and one which clearly shows the defect of the hypothesis.

'As the essence of a body consists in power, the application of power to dimensions follows naturally, according to the intention of God, Who has willed that all should be done according to certain mathematical rules—in number, weight, and measure. And it is, in consequence of this, that bodies do not act, ordinarily, *in distans;* that they occupy at one time a greater, at another a less space, etc.

'However, the laws which God has ordained for the maintenance of the good order of things do not bind Himself, nor do they prevent Him from changing because of reasons of a higher order.'

One other passage we may quote, and then—as

far as the limits of this lecture permit—we shall have the opinions hereon of Leibnitz clearly set before us.

Matter is not extension. Extension is not matter, but is a separable accident of matter. This our author proves by a series of arguments too technical for a popular audience. We shall, therefore, quote but one of his proofs:

'If place be different from the thing placed—or space from body—so also will matter be different from extension. Now, certainly, place is different from the thing placed—space is different from body—for we are all led by a natural impulse to acknowledge the distinction.' Therefore matter is different from extension.[1]

Again, 'the individual essence of a thing, or that which causes it to be that thing, and to remain one and the same through manifold changes,' cannot be identical with extension. For when, for example, a block of ice is melted into water, this water superheated into steam, this steam condensed into vapour, the four—ice, water, steam, vapour—are all one and the same substance or essence. Yet their extension (or dimensions) is entirely changed. Consequently, the essence of body is distinct from the dimensions, or extension, of body. Hence, body may be divested by Nature of some of its extension, and by God of all of its extension. Because 'things which are really distinct may be separated by the absolute power of God, and that in such a way as that either

[1] 'System,' p. 113.

the one may subsist and the other be destroyed;[1] or both may subsist, but separately.'[2]

Secondary qualities, such as resistance and extension, can be varied by the forces of Nature:

'Nature herself, without destroying the essence, takes away dimensions and qualities and substitutes others in their stead.'[3]

God, however, can not only change, but entirely do away with these dimensions and qualities:

'There is nothing to prevent God from changing, or even completely intercepting or impeding, this natural substitution; so that the essence may remain entirely divested of all dimensions and qualities.

'God may cause the same thing to have different dimensions and qualities simultaneously.

'God may cause the same real accident to belong to different substances.

'Lastly, God may sustain the dimensions and qualities, the thing or essence being entirely taken away.'[4]

It is often objected that these suppositions involve a contradiction in terms. Leibnitz, however, utterly denies that objection:

'Nor is it possible to conceive any contradiction

[1] For instance, in the Eucharist the accidents of bread and wine subsist, while the substances of bread and wine are destroyed; the substances of Christ's Body and Blood subsist, while the accidents of His Body and Blood are destroyed.

[2] 'System,' p. 116. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.* God sustains the dimensions and qualities of bread and wine when the things or essences—the substances of bread and wine—are entirely taken away.

in these suppositions. For if the real distinction' (between substance or essence on the one hand, and qualities and dimensions on the other hand) 'be once admitted, the reason is the same for them all; and the existence of substance, and of real accidents, as well as their union, are equally dependent on God's will.'

In the Holy Eucharist the qualities and dimensions of bread and wine are distinct and separable from the substances of bread and wine. Not, however, *naturally*, but only *supernaturally* separable. For there are no forces in Nature capable of separating the substances of bread and wine from all their qualities and all their dimensions. God, however, can do it:

'Since the nature of things is nothing else than God's ordinary mode of action, it is equally easy for Him to follow the ordinary mode, or to adopt an extraordinary one, according as His Wisdom requires.'[1]

X

These extracts will suffice to show that Leibnitz thought but lightly of the mathematical and philosophical difficulties which opponents marshal against the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist; His opinion, too, is all the more valuable because he was a convert from Cartesianism to the Catholic position. For, after premising that he 'had applied himself, and that in no perfunctory manner, to the study of mathematics, mechanics, and experimental philosophy'—no empty

[1] 'System,' p. 117.

boast, coming, as it did, from one of the most brilliant mathematical and philosophical geniuses of his own or of any other age—he confesses that 'in the beginning we inclined to the very opinions to which we have just alluded, yet we have been compelled, by the progress of study, to return to the principles of the old philosophy.'[1]

We may now sum up his views:

1. He teaches that the Mass is a Sacrifice.

2. He holds to an objective Real Presence.

3. He shows that Churches, 'except the Reformed and those that have sunk lower than the Reformed,' all admit the Real Presence.

4. He upholds Transubstantiation and contends that the Real Presence cannot be brought about in any other mode or manner.

5. He points out that Transubstantiation, so far from being opposed to the Protestant Confessions, of necessity follows from those Confessions.

6. He argues that quantity and qualities are not of the essence of body; therefore, that body is really distinct from its dimensions and qualities; hence that body is separable from its dimensions and qualities; consequently that, by Divine power, body can exist without either qualities or dimensions, and that qualities and dimensions can exist without substance.

7. He proves that, as material substance is not essentially extended, it is not limited essentially to one place, but may, at one and the same time, exist in many places widely apart.

[1] 'System,' p. 112.

8. He explains that Christ's Body and Blood, in the Eucharist, are called 'bread and wine' because they are under the accidents of bread and wine.

9. He contends that the accidents of bread and wine do not inhere in Christ's Body and Blood, but are upheld and kept in existence by the power of God acting as an efficient cause.

10. He shows that the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are brought about, instantaneously, by the words of consecration uttered by the priest in the Mass.

The Jews of old asked—as do their modern imitators—'How can this man give us His flesh to eat?'

We answer this question by asking another:

'Why can He not?'

For this Man is God. But whatever is intrinsically possible—whatever is not a contradiction in terms—God can do. Is Transubstantiation a contradiction in terms? If any opponent thinks it is, let him offer us a proof. At any rate, ranged against him, and ranged with us, stands the great Leibnitz—philosopher, theologian, mathematician, man of the world!

LECTURE X

TESTIMONIES OF THE LITURGIES

HAVING now, in a popular fashion, discussed the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament as that doctrine is found in the Bible and admitted by Leibnitz, we now go on to inquire what evidence can be found for that same doctrine in the early Liturgies of the Church.

But that I may place this evidence distinctly before your minds, you must allow me, first of all, to clear the way with one or two preliminary explanations.

There is good cause to believe—for reasons which I need not here set forth—that no public Liturgy of the Church was committed to writing earlier than about 350 A.D. The Liturgies of the various Churches were handed down till the middle of the fourth century solely by tradition. This was a result of the 'Disciplina Arcani'—the 'Discipline of the Secret'—according to which it was for centuries the usual custom of the Church to hide, as far as might be, the leading mysteries of the Christian religion from the pagans, and even from the catechumens. This discipline accounts for the guarded language of early writers concerning the Eucharist, who either care-

fully conceal what actually took place, or speak of it only in the most ambiguous terms. Take but one instance. Tatian, a Greek Father who flourished 150 A.D., writes thus:

'In what do we injure you, O ye Gentiles? Why have ye abhorred the followers of God's word, as if we were the most wicked of men? No; amongst us there is no eating of human flesh.'[1]

Tatian there repels the charge that Christians murdered and ate an infant; but he does not explain what they did eat. Had, however, the rite concealed been nothing more than the eating of bread and the drinking of wine, the calumnies of the pagans would have been meaningless, and meaningless, too, would have been the sufferings of the martyrs who preferred death rather than reveal the Eucharistic mystery.

But when this discipline of silence ended, the Liturgies were put in writing, and were designated either by the name of the founder of the Church in which they were first used, or of the individual under whose care they were first published.

The Liturgies were numerous, but whenever used, and in whatever part of Christendom, they were all practically copies of three great originals.

These three originals are:

1. The Liturgy of St. James, called also the Liturgy of Jerusalem.

2. The Liturgy of St. Mark, called also the Liturgy of Alexandria.

3. The Roman Liturgy, called also the Liturgy of St. Peter.

[1] 'Orat. cont. Græcos,' n. 25, p. 268, ed. Bend. S. Justini.

The Liturgy of St. James is followed more or less by all the Oriental Liturgies, orthodox, schismatical, and heretical.

The Liturgy of St. Mark is followed similarly by the Ethiopian.

The Roman Liturgy is followed by the Ambrosian and by the Liturgies of Roman Africa.

However, the Gothic Liturgy of Gaul and Spain is an exception, and indicates a distinct rite, independent of any of the three great originals just mentioned.

As one of these greater Liturgies can be traced to the fourth, and three others to the fifth century, and as they agree in essentials, their high authority must be recognised by anyone who wishes to know the doctrines, and to be in conformity with the primitive Christian Church.

I

We may begin with the Liturgy of St. James (the Liturgy of Jerusalem).

In the Syriac language this Liturgy is used by the Jacobites (Monophysites) throughout the ancient patriarchate of Antioch. In the Greek language, it is used at Jerusalem by the Melchites, who are orthodox.

As to its date, the Monophysite heresy was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, so that this Liturgy is older than that. It is probably as old as the fourth century.

We now give some extracts from it:

A

'*Rubric.* The priest bows down, first on this side, and then on that, and prays thus:

'We offer Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice. . . .'[1]

'Send down, O Lord, Thy most Holy Spirit upon these holy gifts, and make this bread to be the Holy Body of Thy Christ, and this cup to be the Precious Blood of Thy Christ.'

'And may they be to all who partake of them for remission of sins and for eternal life.'

B

At the elevation of the gifts the priest says:

'Holy things for holy persons.'

And the people answer:[2]

'One Holy, one Lord, Jesus Christ.'

C

When the priest breaks the bread, he takes one half in his right hand and the other half in his left hand; then, dipping the right hand half in the chalice, says:

'The union of the most Holy Body and of the Precious Blood of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ.'

[1] Renaudot, 'Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio,' ii., p. 1. 'Bibl. Pat.,' ii.; Paris, 1624. Neale's 'Primitive Liturgies,' p. 46.

[2] Neale, p. 58.

D

When the priest signs the bread, he says:

'Behold the Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, Who taketh away the sin of the world, sacrificed for the life and salvation of the world.'[1]

E

When the priest distributes one part of the Host into each cup, he says:

'A holy portion of Christ, full of grace and truth. . . . Taste and see how sweet is the Lord, Who is broken, yet not divided; is given to the faithful, yet not consumed, for the remission of sins, for everlasting life. . . . O Lord our God, the heavenly bread, the life of the world, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee, and am not worthy to partake of Thy immaculate mysteries. But as Thou art a merciful God, make me worthy by Thy grace to partake without condemnation of Thy Holy Body and Precious Blood, for the remission of my sins and for eternal life.'

To sum up. The Liturgy of St. James sets forth that:

1. The Holy Eucharist in the Mass is an Unbloody Sacrifice.

2. By consecration, bread is made to be Christ's Body, and wine is made to be Christ's Blood.

3. The consecrated bread and wine are 'Holy Things'—viz., Christ our Lord, the Lamb sacrificed for the world.

[1] Neale, p. 59.

4. Christ is broken, yet is not divided; is given as food, yet is not consumed.

5. The worthy partaking of Christ's Body and Blood is for the remission of sins, and wins eternal life.

II

Let us briefly examine next the great Liturgy of St. Mark (the Liturgy of Alexandria).

This is the Liturgy of the Church of Alexandria, a patriarchate which included Egypt, Lybia, Pentapolis, and Ethiopia.

It is of the same rite as the Coptic Liturgy of the Monophysites, and probably represents about the same age as the Liturgy of St. James.

A

At the Anaphora, or Oblation of the Elements, the priest prays:

'We offer Thee this reasonable and unbloody worship' (*Latreia*), 'which all nations offer Thee, O Lord, from the rising to the setting of the sun.'[1]

B

At the Invocation of the Holy Ghost:

'Send down upon us, and upon these loaves, and upon these cups, Thy Holy Spirit, that He may sanctify and perfect them, as God Almighty, and make the bread indeed the Body; and make the chalice indeed the Blood of the New Testament, of

[1] *Cf.* Malachi i. 11. Neale, p. 14. Renaudot, i., p. 145.

our Lord Himself and God and Saviour and Supreme King, Jesus Christ.'[1]

And, again:

'Make us glad with the Divine influences of Thy Holy Spirit . . . that we may worthily partake of the good things lying before us, the Spotless Body and Precious Blood of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.'[2]

At the Communion of the clergy, the Priest, giving the consecrated bread, says:

'The Holy Body.'

And giving the cup, says:

'The Precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour.'[3]

At the Post-Communion:

'May they' (Thy Body and Blood) 'be to all of us who participate in them for faith, for sobriety . . . for the glory of Thy Holy Name, for the remission of sins.'[4]

And, again:

'Thou hast bestowed upon us, O Lord, sanctification in the participation of the most Holy Body and of the Precious Blood of Thine only-begotten Son.'[5]

To sum up. The Liturgy of St. Mark sets forth that:

1. The Mass is an Unbloody Worship.
2. It is the worship of *Latreia*, due to God alone.
3. It is the fulfilment of Malachi's famous prophecy.

[1] Renaudot, i., p. 157. Neale, p. 24.
[2] Renaudot, p. 160.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 162.
[4] Neale, p. 24.
[5] Renaudot, p. 165

4. The bread is made to be Christ's Body, and the wine is made to be Christ's Blood.

5. In Communion we receive Christ's Holy Body and His Precious Blood.

6. By the worthy receiving of this Body and Blood our sins are remitted and God is glorified.

III

Let us now turn to the Roman Liturgy.

This Liturgy was well known in the time of St. Gregory the Great (died 590). It has also been traced up to the time of Pope Gelasius (died 492). Moreover, there exists a Sacramentary, which dates as early as St. Leo (died 440), which coincides in all essentials with the Roman Liturgy. There is, therefore, good reason to think that Pope Innocent I. (died 402) was justified in his assertion that the Liturgy of Rome is of Apostolic origin, and has come down to us from St. Peter.

A

At the Oblation this Liturgy reads thus:

'We beseech Thee, O Lord, to accept this oblation—which . . . vouchsafe to make blessed . . . that it may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.'

B

After the Consecration:

'Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants . . . offer unto Thy glorious Majesty of Thy gifts and presents,

a pure host, a holy host, an immaculate host, the holy Bread of eternal life, and the Chalice of everlasting salvation. Upon which vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as Thou didst vouchsafe to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the Sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high priest Melchisedech offered to Thee, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate host. . . . May this commixture and consecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be to us that receive unto eternal life."

C

Bowing at the *Agnus Dei*, the priest says:

'Lamb of God, Who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.

'Let not the participation of Thy Body, O Lord Jesus Christ, which I, though unworthy, presume to receive, be to my judgment and condemnation; but through Thy mercy may it be available unto me for the safeguard and cure of mind and body.'

D

At the Communion the priest says thrice:

'Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof, but speak the word only and my soul shall be healed.'

E

And in receiving Communion himself, as well as in giving it to others, the priest again declares that it is:

'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Having now, so far as they concern the Eucharist, given a bird's-eye view of the three great Liturgies from which the rest are probably derived, we may briefly consider some of these derivatives.

IV

And first we turn to the Alexandrian Liturgy, called also the Liturgy of St. Basil.

This Liturgy is in universal use through the Greek Church. It may be traced to the fourth century.[1]

A

The Mass is an Unbloody Sacrifice:

'Turn not away, O God, from us sinners who offer to Thee this awful and Unbloody Sacrifice.'[2]

The Victim, God, is sacrificed:

'This Sacrifice, wherein is not the blood of the Law, nor carnal righteousness, but the Lamb, is indeed spiritual.'[3]

B

At the Elevation, when the larger part of the consecrated Host is lifted up:

PRIEST. Holy things for the holy!

The Holy Body and the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

PEOPLE. Amen.

[1] *Cf.* Waterworth, 'Faith of Catholics,' ii., pp. 185, 186, note 3.

[2] This Liturgy is given by Renaudot, i., p. 57 *et seq.* See p. 57.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

PRIEST. The Holy, Precious Body and True Blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

PEOPLE. Amen.

PRIEST. Body and Blood of Emmanuel our God, this is truly. Amen.

PEOPLE. Amen. I believe, I believe, I confess, till my last breath, that It is the very life-giving Flesh of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord, our God, our Saviour, Jesus Christ.

V

Next we may consider the Ambrosian Liturgy.

This Liturgy is now used only in the Church of Milan. It is thought to have been long in use in that same Church in the days of St. Ambrose (died A.D. 396). The edition published by Pamelius in 1560 is perhaps the most ancient of the various forms under which it has been published. We quote from that edition.

A

The bread is made into Christ's Body:

'Receive, O most merciful Father, this holy bread, that it may be made the Body of Thine only-begotten Son.'

B

The wine is made into Christ's Blood:

'Receive, O Holy Trinity, this chalice, wine mixed with water, that it may be made the Blood of Thine only-begotten Son.'

C

At the Oblation:

'Make for us, O God, this oblation, approved, reasonable, acceptable, that it may be made for us the Body and Blood of Thy Son, our God and our Lord, Jesus Christ.'

D

When the Host is broken:

'Thy Body, O Christ, is broken; the chalice is blessed; may Thy Blood be ever unto us unto life and unto the salvation of our souls.'

E

When the particle is placed in the chalice:

'May the commixture of the consecrated Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ profit us who eat and receive unto life and joy everlasting.'

F

On taking the Sacrament into his hand, the priest says:

'Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Eternal God, grant unto us so to receive the Body of Jesus Christ, Thy Son and my Lord, that it may not turn to my judgment, but to the remission of my sins.'

G

When the Communion is given, the priest says:

'The Body of Christ!'[1]

[1] Pamelius, Liturg. Latin, tom. i.

VI

Let us look next into the Coptic Liturgy (called also the Liturgy of St. Basil).

It is used by the Eutychians and Jacobites in Egypt.[1]

A

The bread and wine are changed into Christ's Body and Blood:

'O Lord Jesus Christ . . . look down on this bread and on this chalice . . . bless them, sanctify them, and consecrate them; change them, so that this bread indeed may become Thy Holy Body; and that this mixture in this chalice may become Thy Precious Blood; that they may be to us all a safeguard, a medicine, the salvation of our souls and bodies.'[2]

B

At the Epiclesis:

'PRIEST. We beseech Thee, Christ our God . . . that Thy Holy Spirit may come down upon these gifts which lie before us, and may sanctify them, and may make them the Holy of Holies.

'PEOPLE. Amen.

'PRIEST. And may He make this bread to be the holy Body of our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and for eternal life to him who shall partake of it. And this chalice to be the Precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.

'PEOPLE. Amen.'[3]

[1] It is given by Renaudot, i., p. 1 *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

C

Before the Communion:

'Let us beseech Him, our Almighty Lord and God, to make us worthy of the Communion and participation of His holy mysteries, the Holy Body and Precious Blood of His Christ.'[1]

D

At the Communion:

'Holy things for holy persons. . . . The Holy Body and true Precious Blood.'

VII

The time at our disposal is now coming to an end. We must therefore conclude our evidence for the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, as that evidence is found in the Liturgies of East and West. But we have far from exhausted the subject. We might have adduced similar and not less cogent testimony from many other Liturgies—for instance, from the Syriac Liturgy;[2] the Liturgy of the Nestorians (called also the Liturgy of the Apostles);[3] another Coptic Liturgy (called sometimes the Liturgy of St. Gregory the Illuminator;[4] another Alexandrian Liturgy, also called, like the preceding, the Liturgy of St. Gregory;[5] another Coptic Liturgy, called the Liturgy of St. Cyril;[6] the Ethiopian Liturgy, called the Liturgy of the Apostles;[7] the Gothico-Gallican Liturgy, which was used in that part of France

[1] Renaudot, p. 19. [2] *Ibid.*, ii., 548. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 584.

[4] He was consecrated Bishop by Leontius in the beginning of the fourth century. Renaudot, i., p. 26.

[5] *Ibid.*, i., p. 90. [6] *Ibid.*, i., p. 38. [7] *Ibid.*, i., p. 499

anciently called Gallia Narbonensis, containing the provinces of Narbonne, Languedoc, Provence, and Savoy;[1] the Gallican Liturgy, which was used in the other provinces of France. It was in use in Britain also, having been introduced here by St. Germain, who came over with Lupus about the year 429 to free the British Church from the Pelagian heresy;[2] the Mozarabic Liturgy, which was used in the churches of Spain at least as early as the fifth century.[3] It is called also Mixtarabic, because the Spaniards were conquered by the Moors, or Arabians, became by marriage intermingled with them, and thus were styled Mixed-Arabians;[4] the Liturgy of Theodorus, who was Bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, and was the friend and master of Nestorius.[5]

VIII

We conclude with the magnificent Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. It was called also the Liturgy of Constantinople, and is still in use in that patriarchate. It follows the Liturgy of St. James. Goar published it in his 'Euchologium,' Paris, 1647.

[1] It was published by Mabillon at Paris in 1685. See Brett, 'A Collection of the Principal Liturgies used in the Eucharist,' p. 327.

[2] It was published by Mabillon from the same MS. *Cf.* Stillingfleet's 'Antiq. of British Churches,' p. 216. Brett, p. 327.

[3] *Cf.* Cardinal Bona, 'De Rebus. Liturg.,' i., c. 2.

[4] St. Augustine, who came over to convert our Saxon ancestors in the sixth century, brought with him the Roman Liturgy, and it has been in use ever since. Brett, pp. 327, 328.

[5] Theodore died in 428. His Liturgy is given by Renaudot, ii., 616.

A

During the singing of the Cherubic Hymn, the priest prays:

'On Thee I call . . . that I may stand by this Thy holy altar, and sacrifice Thy holy and spotless Body and precious Blood.'[1]

B

When the priest begins the Consecration he says:

'We offer Thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice.'

C

After the words of Institution:

DEACON. Bless the holy bread.

PRIEST. Make this bread the precious Body of thy Christ. Make what is in this chalice the precious Blood of Thy Christ; changing them by Thy Holy Spirit.

DEACON. Amen. Amen. Amen. That they may be to those who partake, for sobriety of soul, for remission of sins, for the communion of the Holy Spirit, for the fulness of the kingdom of heaven, for confidence in Thee, and not for judgment or condemnation.[2]

The Rubric directs that when the deacon sees the priest stretching forth his hands and touching the Holy Bread to make the holy Elevation, he says, 'Let us attend.' And the priest, elevating the Holy Bread, exclaims:

'Holy things for holy persons.'

[1] Neale, p. 106. [2] Goar, p. 77.

And the people make answer:

'One Holy, one Lord, Jesus Christ.'

The Rubric again directs that the priest and the deacon *adore* in the place where they stand, saying secretly thrice, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner.'

D

Breaking the Holy Bread into four parts, the priest says:

'The Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, is broken and divided. He is broken, but not diminished. He is eaten, but not consumed. He sanctifies those who are partakers of Him.'[1]

E

Before the Communion:

DEACON (to the priest): Make me partaker of the precious and holy Body of our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

PRIEST. I give unto thee the precious and holy and spotless Body of our Lord and God and Saviour, for the remission of sins, and for eternal life.

F

At the priest's Communion, he says:

'I believe, Lord, and confess that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'[2]

G

At the deacon's Communion. The priest holds in his hands the holy cup:

PRIEST. Deacon, draw near.

DEACON. Behold, I draw near to the immortal

[1] Goar, p. 81. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

King; and I believe, Lord, and confess that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, Who didst come into the world to save sinners.

PRIEST. Thou, O deacon, servant of God, receivest the precious and holy Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and for eternal life.[1]

IX

So much for the evidence from Eastern Liturgies. This evidence might be almost indefinitely increased, but what has here been adduced will serve as a specimen of the rest, and is amply sufficient for our purpose. For we may confidently appeal to all those earnest Christians whose eyes prejudice has not sealed, and whose ears bigotry has not turned stone-deaf—above all, we may appeal to all who wish to know and follow the doctrines and practices of the first six centuries—to say whether all this repetition, from every part of the Christian world, of prayer, adoration, and sacrificial actions, so reverently and minutely directed, does not teach clearly, and signify unmistakably, these four great doctrines: the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, Unbloody Sacrifice of a Living Victim, and Divine worship of the Holy Eucharist.

Assuredly, these Liturgies of the Early Church, in every part of the Christian world, breathe one mighty spirit of reverential Sacrifice and of Divine adoration in that holy Mass which is a propitiation alike for the quick and the dead.

[1] Goar, p. 83.

LECTURE XI

TESTIMONIES OF THE EARLY FATHERS TO THE REAL PRESENCE

We have now discussed the doctrine of the Real Presence as that doctrine is found in the Bible and in the early Liturgies. In the present lecture we go on to investigate the traditional evidence for this same teaching, as that evidence is set forth in the pages of the Early Fathers of the Church.

Moreover, we will limit our study to the first four centuries; first, because they furnish us with enough, and more than enough, evidence to prove our point up to the hilt; secondly, because the testimonies of the fifth century are so abundant that it would be impossible to compress them within the limits of a short lecture.

The evidences which we are about to cull and to set forth briefly we may conveniently arrange under centuries.

I. The First Century.

St. Ignatius of Antioch (died 107).

This Greek Father, speaking of certain heretics—the Docetæ, who denied the reality of Christ's Body—wrote thus:[1]

[1] 'Epist. ad Smyrn.,' n. 7.

'They abstain from Eucharist and prayer because they confess not that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again.

'Haste ye, then, to partake of the one Eucharist. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the uniting of His Blood, and one Altar.'

And, again, in his Letter to the Romans (n. 7):

'I have no taste for corruptible food, nor for the pleasure of this life. I wish for God's Bread, heavenly Bread, Bread of life, which is the Flesh of Jesus Christ. And I wish for God's draught, His Blood, which is Love without corruption and Life for evermore.'[1]

And in his Letter to the Philadelphians he writes to the same effect (chap. iv.):

'Be careful to use one Eucharist. For there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the uniting of His Blood, and one Altar.'

II. The Second Century.

The above is a clear testimony for the first century, and it bears out completely the doctrine of the four Evangelists. For that the Holy Eucharist was a well-established institution in the first century St. Paul is our witness for the first half of the century, St. Ignatius for the second half.

[1] 'God is love' (1 John iv. 8); 'I am the Life' (John xi. 25).

A. *St. Justin.*

For the second century let St. Justin, surnamed the 'Philosopher and Martyr,' be our first witness. He was born at the beginning of the second century at Sichem in Samaria; travelled through Asia, Egypt, and Italy; and taught publicly in Rome. He wrote about A.D. 140.

In his 'First Apology,' having explained that none but a baptized person is allowed to approach Holy Communion, he describes the first Communion after baptism (nn. 65, 66), and says:

'For we do not receive these things' (bread and wine mixed with water) 'as common bread and common drink. But in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made Flesh by the word of God, had both Flesh and Blood for our salvation, even so we have been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made . . . is both the Flesh and the Blood of that same Incarnate Jesus.'

B. *St. Irenæus.*

St. Irenæus also was an Asiatic, born in the middle of this century. A disciple of St. Polycarp, he was educated among the disciples of St. John the Evangelist. He died a martyr in 202.

In his great work 'Against Heresies' (v., c. 2, nn. 2, 3) he says:

'The mingled cup and the created bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist becomes Christ's Body and Blood.'

'The cup which is His Blood and the bread which is His Body.'

'The Eucharist which is Christ's Body and Blood.'

C. *Clement of Alexandria.*

This Greek Father, born of pagan parents, was instructed in all the learning of his age. He went to Alexandria, became a public teacher, and was ordained a Catholic priest. He died about 217.

In his 'Pædagogus' (I., vi.) he writes:

'"Eat My Flesh," Christ says, "and drink My Blood." The Lord supplies us with these befitting elements, and gives Flesh and pours forth Blood. . . . O the incredible mystery! He bids us put aside the old and carnal corruption as well as the old food, but being made partakers of the other new food of Christ, receiving Him if possible to place Him within ourselves, and to have the Saviour in our breasts.'

Clement calls the Eucharist a mystery. Were it only bread and wine it would be no mystery.

D. *Tertullian.*

This African Father was born at Carthage about the year 160. Both his parents were pagans, nor was he himself converted to Christianity until his thirtieth year.

In his book 'On Idolatry' (pp. 88, 89) he writes:

'It might be a small matter if they' (idolatrous priests) 'should receive from other hands that which they defile; but they themselves also deliver to others that which they have themselves defiled. Ay,

makers of idols are chosen into the ministry of the Church. Horrid sin! The Jews laid violent hands but once upon Christ. These men every day assault His Body. O hands worthy to be cut off! Let them now consider whether it was said only in a figure: "If thine hand scandalize thee, cut it off." '

Is it likely that this perfervid language was used of those who handled unworthily mere bread and mere wine? Let Tertullian himself answer:

'What hands ought more to be cut off than those by which the *Body of the Lord* is offended?'

Again, in his work 'On Prayer' (n. 6) Tertullian says:

'Christ is our bread, because Christ is life and bread is life. He says: "I am the bread of life." And, again: "The bread is the Word of the living God, Who cometh down from heaven." Then, again, because in the bread is understood His Body: "This is My Body." Wherefore, in praying for daily bread, we beg a perpetuity in Christ and an indivisibility from His Body.'

We will quote from this Father but one more testimony. In his work on 'The Resurrection of the Flesh' (n. 8) he writes:

'The flesh is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, in order that the soul also may be fattened of God.'

III. The Third Century.

We now pass into the third century, and here the first witness whom we summon to give his testimony is—

A. *Origen.*

He was an Egyptian, and was born about 185. In his work against Celsus[1] he writes:

'We eat the loaves that have been offered with thanksgiving, and with prayer made over the gifts, after they' (the loaves) 'have become a certain holy Body.'[2]

And in his 'Thirteenth Homily on Exodus' (n. 3) he again writes:

'Ye who have been accustomed to be present at the Divine mysteries, know that when ye receive the Body of the Lord ye take care, with all caution and veneration, that no part thereof, however tiny, shall fall, lest any portion of the consecrated gift should be lost. For if any morsel of it should fall through your negligence, you think yourself, and rightly, to be guilty.'

In his 'Seventh Homily on Numbers' (n. 2) Origen again writes:

'In those days manna was enigmatically food. Now, the Flesh of the Word of God is openly true food, as Christ Himself says: "My Flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed."'

And once again in his 'Seventeenth Homily on Jeremiah' (n. 13):

'If thou wilt go up with Christ to celebrate the Passover, He will give to thee that Bread of benediction, His own Body, and will impart to thee His own Blood.'

[1] Tom. i., lib. viii., n. 33.

[2] The discipline of the secret here prevents Origen from speaking more openly.

B. *St. Hippolytus.*

This Greek Father was a great name among the men of his own time, though we know little of the details of his life. He was a disciple of St. Irenæus, and flourished about the year 222.

In a fragment that remains to us of a homily of his on Prov. ix.[1] we have the following:

'He' (Christ as Wisdom) 'has prepared His own table' (Prov. ix. 2), 'the promised knowledge of the Holy Trinity and His own precious and pure Body and Blood; and these in the mystic and divine table are daily celebrated, sacrificed for a memorial of the Ever-to-be-remembered, and that first table of the mystical divine supper. . . . "Come, eat My bread and drink the wine which I have mingled for you"—*i.e.*, His own Divine Flesh and His own Precious Blood. These He has given us to eat and to drink for the remission of sins.'

C. *St. Cyprian.*

This great Bishop of Carthage died a martyr in the year 258.

Writing to Cæcilius,[2] he said:

'Who is more a priest of the Most High God than our Lord Jesus Christ, Who offered a sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that same which Melchisedech had offered, that is, bread and wine—namely, His own Body and Blood.'

St. Cyprian[3] next declares that the Mass is one with the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross:

[1] Gallandius, vol. ii., p. 488.

[2] 'Epist.,' 63, n. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*, n. 11.

'For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the great High Priest of God the Father; and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father; and commanded this to be done in remembrance of Himself; surely, that Priest truly acts in Christ's stead who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice in the Church to God the Father when he begins to offer it according as he sees Christ Himself offered it.'

In Letter (57 n. 1) Cyprian, writing during the persecution, declares the Holy Eucharist to be the strength of martyrs:

'Now, peace is necessary, not for the sick, but for the strong! Not, therefore, to the dying, but to the living, must we grant Communion; so as not to leave those unarmed and naked whom we rouse and exhort to battle, but fortify them with the protection of the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . How do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in confession of the Name, if, when about to engage, we deny them the Blood of Christ?'[1]

In his Letter[2] to the people assembled at Thebaris, St. Cyprian wrote, in reference to the approaching persecution and martyrdoms:

'A more severe and fiercer struggle now hangs over us, to which the soldiers of Christ must prepare themselves by faith untainted and by sturdy courage; considering that they therefore daily drink the Cup

[1] In this same Epistle (n. 2) Cyprian refers to daily Mass: 'Priests daily celebrate the Sacrifices of God.'

[2] 58, n. 1.

of the Blood of Christ,[1] that they, too, may be able to shed their blood for Christ.'

And a little further on in the same letter :[2]

'Let us also arm the right hand with the sword of the Spirit, that we may boldly reject the deadly sacrifices [of the pagans], and mindful of the Eucharist, the hand which has received the Lord's Body may embrace the Lord Himself, from Him to receive hereafter the reward of heavenly crowns.'

We had marked other passages for quotation, but there is no time to set them before you. This much, however, we may say: that the Epistles alone of St. Cyprian—not to mention his other works—are crowded with references to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist.

D. *St. Firmilian.*

Firmilian was an illustrious Bishop of Cappadocia in 231. In a Letter to St. Cyprian[3] he writes of those who approach Holy Communion before they have been properly baptized:

'How great is the sin, both of those who admit and of those who are admitted, that, their defilements unwashed by the laver of the Church, their sins not laid aside, they, in Communion rashly granted, touch the Body and Blood of the Lord; whereas it is written: "Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the

[1] This reference proves that daily Communion was then a custom among the laity.

[2] 58, n. 9.

[3] It is Epist. 75 among the 'Epistles of St. Cyprian,' Benedictine ed., n. 23.

cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." '

E. *St. Cornelius.*

St. Cornelius was Pope, and died a martyr in 251. In a Letter to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch,[1] concerning Novatus, he describes how this heretic had induced men, while holding the Sacred Host in their hands, to promise to desert the Pope and to cling to him, Novatus. This Cornelius describes as 'the worst of the absurdities of Novatus.'

'Having made the oblation, and distributed a part to each, whilst giving this, he compels the unhappy men to swear, instead of blessing; holding the hands of the person receiving with both of his own, and not letting them go until the communicant had sworn, in these words: "Swear to me, by the Body and Blood of the Saviour, Jesus Christ, that you will never desert me, nor turn to Cornelius." And the unhappy man is then not suffered to taste until he has first cursed himself.'

F. *St. Dionysius of Alexandria.*

This Greek Father, a convert from paganism, was Bishop of Alexandria about 250.

In a Letter to Basilides (p. 114) he forbids certain women:

'Either to come unto the holy table, or to touch the Body and Blood of Christ.'

And in a Letter to Pope Xystus (pp. 163-165) he

[1] It is given by Eusebius, H.E., bk. vi., ch. 43.

writes to ask what he is to do with a particular individual who had been baptized by heretics, and had then applied to Dionysius to be rebaptized. The saint writes:

'I did not dare to renew from the beginning one who had heard the Eucharists, and joined in the Amen, and stood by the table, and stretched forth his hands for the reception of the holy food, and had received it, and who had partaken, for a considerable time, of the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

IV. The Fourth Century.

No one who listens to the testimonies just adduced can pretend to question the belief in the Real Presence entertained by the first three centuries. Is it, then, worth our while to quote witnesses for the fourth century? Perhaps not; the more so as these witnesses are very numerous, and their testimonies without number? However, to clinch the matter, and to make assurance doubly sure, you will bear with me a little longer, while I cite a few instances from a few of them. And we may begin with—

A. *St. Peter of Alexandria.*

This Greek Father, who died 311 A.D., wrote of those Christians who had apostatized, but afterwards recanted, and suffered for the Catholic faith:[1]

'As to those who, having been betrayed, fell, but went to the combat, and confessed themselves Christians, and after enduring torments were cast

[1] Canon 8, Gallandius, iv., p. 96.

into prison, it is fitting . . . to communicate with them in all things, except in the participation of the Body and of the Blood.'

B. *Eusebius of Cæsarea.*

This Greek writer, who died 310 A.D., was a Semi-Arian, but held the orthodox faith concerning the Blessed Sacrament. He writes:[1]

'We may see, on every day of the Lord's resurrection, called the Lord's Day, those who partake of that holy food and of that saving Body, and who, at the time of eating It, adore the Giver.'

And again:[2]

'He can '*delight in the Lord*' who has his senses, which are the instruments of the soul, so purified as to be able to eat the Living Bread, Christ's vivifying Flesh, and to drink His saving Blood.'

And again, bearing witness to the weekly Communion of lay-folk, he says:[3]

'On every Lord's Day we are vivified by the consecrated Body of the Lord, and have our souls sealed with His precious Blood.'

C. *St. Theodore.*

This Greek Father flourished about 330 A.D. He wrote:[4]

'Let the catechumens . . . so prepare themselves for the sanctification of their souls and bodies as to

[1] In Psa. xxi. 26. [2] In Psa. xxxvi. 4.

[3] 'Ex Tract. de Paschate,' tom. i., pp. 253-257. 'Scriptorum Veterum Nov. Coll. Maii. Romæ.'

[4] Epist. 12; Gallandius, iv., p. 734.

be able to endure the Blood and Body of the Saviour Lord, of which even to think is terrible.'

D. *St. James of Nisibis.*

This, too, is a Greek Father. He flourished about 340 A.D. In one of his sermons on Fasting, he wrote as follows:[1]

'Verily, it is unmeet and impious to let filth pass through that door by which the Lord enters. But thou shouldst abstain from all uncleanness, and then take the Body and Blood of Christ. After which cautiously guard thy mouth through which the King has entered. Neither is it permitted thee any longer to make that mouth a passage for words of uncleanness.'

That is a beautiful thought. It is clear that St. James was not speaking of *symbols* of Christ's Body and Blood!

In another sermon, on Easter,[2] the saint asserts—as the early Fathers repeatedly asserted—that our Lord at the Last Supper celebrated the first Mass, and thus died an Unbloody Victim before He died upon the Cross.

'After Judas[3] had gone out, Christ took bread, blessed, and gave to His disciples, saying: "This is My Body; take ye and eat, all of ye, of this." And over the wine He thus blessed, and said to them: "This is My Blood of a new Testament, which [Blood] is being shed for many unto the

[1] Serm. iii.; 'De Jejunio,' n. 2; Gallandius, v.
[2] Serm. 14; 'De Pasch.,' n. 4-6; Gallandius, tom. v.
[3] St. James holds that Judas did not make a first Communion.

remission of sins. So shall ye do in commemoration of Me when ye shall assemble together."

'But our Lord did this before He was apprehended, and. . . . gave His own Body that they might eat, and His own Blood that they might drink. . . . As, therefore, His Body had been eaten, and His Blood drunk, He was reputed to be among the dead. For our Lord, with His own hands, gave His own Body for food; and, though He was not yet crucified, He gave His own Blood for drink. Therefore, he was among the dead during the night on which He was apprehended. . . .'

'Therefore, to the Jews was given the manna as nourishment, but to us our Lord has given His own Flesh as food.'

E. *St. Hilary.*

This Latin Father was a Frenchman, born at Poictiers in the early fourth century. He flourished about 350 A.D. In his works he bears lustrous and repeated testimony to the Real Presence, and he, too, affirms that the first Mass preceded the Crucifixion. Referring to Christ's agony in the Garden, and to His petition that the chalice might pass from Him, St. Hilary writes:

'Was He unwilling to suffer? Nay, He had just before consecrated the Blood of His own Body to be poured forth for the remission of sins.'[1]

And in his great work on the Trinity[2] he repeatedly affirms the doctrine of the Real Presence in language so clear, that to say he understood the consecrated

[1] 'Com. in Matt.,' c. 31, n. 7. [2] VIII., n. 13-17.

bread and wine to be but symbols is in reality to play with words:

'Of the reality of the Flesh and Blood there is no room left for doubt. For now, both by the declaration of the Lord Himself, and by our faith, it is truly Flesh and it is truly Blood. And this Flesh and this Blood being eaten and drunk effect this, that we are in Christ and Christ is in us. Is not this the truth? Let this not be the truth only for those who deny that Christ Jesus is true God.'

F. *St. Cyril of Jerusalem.*

This Greek Father, who died in 386, speaks with such unmistakable plainness about the Real Presence, and denies so emphatically the Protestant doctrine that the consecrated bread and wine are but figures and symbols, that his testimony alone settles the question. In his Catechism[1] he writes:

'The bread and wine of the Eucharist, before the holy invocation of the Trinity, was simple bread and wine; whereas, after the invocation, the bread becomes Christ's Body and the wine becomes Christ's Blood.'

And, in another place of the same work,[2] having quoted the words by which Christ instituted the Mass and the Holy Eucharist, St. Cyril writes:

'He Himself, therefore, having declared, and said, concerning the bread, "This is My Body," who shall henceforth dare to doubt? And He Himself

[1] 'Catech. Mystag.,' i. (xix.), n. 7.
[2] *Ibid.*, iv., pp. 319-322.

having settled the matter and said, "This is My Blood," who shall ever doubt, saying, "This is not His Blood"?

'At Cana of Galilee he turned water into wine. Is He undeserving of belief when He turned wine into Blood?'

St. Cyril emphatically declares that the bread and wine are not merely signs and symbols:[1]

'Do not contemplate the bread and wine as bare [elements], for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, Christ's Body and Blood.

'Therefore, though sense suggest this to thee [that they are bare elements], yet let the faith stablish thee. Judge not the question from the taste. By faith be fully assured beyond misgiving that thou hast been given Christ's Body and Blood. . . .

'And be fully persuaded that what *seems* bread is not bread, but Christ's Body; and what *seems* wine is not wine, but Christ's Blood.'

If that language is not clear, we should like to know what clearness means.

G. *St. Ephrem, the Syrian.*

This Eastern wrote about 370. He says:

'When eating the Body of the only-begotten Son, and drinking His Blood, thou dost hold converse with the God Who is King over all. Rejoice in thy gladness that thou hast been found worthy to become His temple.'[2]

[1] 'Catech. Mystag.,' iv., pp. 319-322.
[2] 'Gr. Lat. De Vita Spir.,' tom. i., n. 32.

And in another place :[1]

'Christ's Body, restored from death to life [is the Body], which the Church eats.'

And again :[2]

'The Living Food of which we partake is the Lord's Body.'

And again :[3]

'The just, as well as sinners, eat the Living Body which is upon the altar.'

Next, St Ephrem affirms that the Holy Eucharist is no shadow, but is the reality :[4]

'Had the Jews been willing to celebrate a feast, and to testify that they had received salvation from God their Saviour, still this were but a shadow. But the reality was shown by our Lord when He broke His own Body, and distributed His own Blood, saying: "This do ye in commemoration of Me."'

And out of innumerable other testimonies of St. Ephrem we may select three more, brief ones:

'O Son of the living God, when I am labouring to cross the fiery ford [after death], may the flames grow dull as they come in contact with Thy Body and Blood.'[5]

'Suffer me, O Lord, for the sake of that most holy Body and Blood of Thine, which I, though unworthy, have received out of the hands of the priests, to obtain Thy mercy.'[6]

[1] 'Com. in Jud.,' tom. i., part ii., p. 324.
[2] 'Com. in Isaiah,' tom. i., part ii., p. 324.
[3] 'Syr. Com. in Isaiah,' tom. ii., part ii., p. 40.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 61.
[5] 'Syr. Paræn,' 13, tom. iii., p. 432.
[6] 'Paræn,' 31, p. 482.

'Partake of the spotless Body of the Lord with all faith, having a most full assurance that thou sincerely eatest the very Lamb Himself.'[1]

H. *St. Gregory of Nazianzum.*

This Greek Father flourished in 370 A.D. He writes:[2]

'Stagger not in thy reason when thou hearest of the Blood of God . . . but, without a doubt, eat His Body, drink His Blood, if thou desirest life, not disbelieving what is said about flesh.'

I. *St. Ambrose.*

This great Doctor of the Church of Milan wrote in 385 A.D. His pages are filled with references to, and proofs of, the Real Presence.

'Perhaps thou wilt say: "I see a different thing. How then shall I receive the Body of Christ?" It yet remains for us to prove this also.'

And then he pours out proof after proof.

Again, in his book on Mysteries:[3]

'The Lord Jesus Christ cries out: "This is My Body." *Before* the benediction of heavenly words, another thing is named. *After* the Consecration, His Body is meant. He Himself says it is His own Blood. *Before* the Consecration it is called something else; after, Blood. And thou saying, "Amen"—*i.e.*, "It is true."

[1] 'Gr. Adv. Scrutat.,' tom. iii., pp. 423, 424.
[2] 'Orat.,' 42, tom. i., p. 690
[3] C. 8, 9, ii. 336.

Will anyone venture to suggest that St. Ambrose was, after all, thinking only of signs and symbols? He Himself tells us that he was *not* comparing manna with the Eucharist. He says:[1]

'All who eat that bread [manna] died in the desert. But this food which thou dost receive, this Living Bread that cometh down from heaven, supplies us with the substance of eternal life; and whoso shall have eaten it shall never die; and it is the Body of Christ.

'Consider, now, whether [manna] the bread of angels or Christ's Flesh be more excellent.

'That came down from heaven; this is above heaven. That was of heaven; this of the Lord of heaven. That was liable to corruption, if preserved to another day; this is free from all corruption, and whoso only eats it cannot feel corruption.

'For the Jews, water flowed from a rock; for thee, Blood out of Christ.

'They were temporarily satiated with water; thy thirst is for ever quenched with Blood.

'That was in a shadow; this in verity.

'If, then, thou dost marvel at manna, which is but a shadow, how great is that [reality] whereof the very shadow fills thee with wonder.

'Learn that what took place among the fathers[2] was but a shadow. These things were done in a figure of what is ours. Thou hast seen that ours is more excellent. For light is more excellent than

[1] C. 8, 9, ii. 336.

[2] He is referring to John vi. 31: 'Our fathers did eat manna in the desert.'

shade; reality than symbol; the Maker's Body than manna from heaven.'

J. *St. Jerome.*

This Latin Father flourished about 385 A.D. His testimony to the Real Presence is clear to a degree:

'The fatted calf, immolated for the salvation of the penitent, is the Saviour Himself, with whose Flesh we are daily fed, whose Blood we daily drink.'[1]

And again:[2]

'Let us understand that the bread which the Lord broke and gave to His disciples is the Body of the Lord, the Saviour. . . . The bread which came down from heaven is the Body of the Lord, and the wine which He gave to His disciples is the Blood of the New Testament.'

And speaking of Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, who carried the Blessed Sacrament on his person, St. Jerome said:[3]

'Nothing is wealthier than he who carries the Body of the Lord in an ozier box, His Blood in a phial.'

And in another place[4] he writes:

'We know that wine is consecrated into the Blood of Christ.'

K. *St. John Chrysostom.*

We have come to the end of our time, and so we conclude this brief selection of passages from a few selected authors. To end, then, let St. John

[1] Epist. 21, 'Ad Damas.,' col. 79, tom. i.
[2] *Ibid.*, Epist. 120, 'Ad. Hedibiam,' n. ii., cols. 817, 818.
[3] *Ibid.*, Epist. 125, 'Ad Rusti.,' n. 20, col. 941.
[4] 'Com. in Galat.,' tom. vii., col. 509.

Chrysostom, the golden-tongued orator of the East, the great Patriarch of Constantinople, let him step forward and give us his views about the Real Presence :

'When thou art about to approach to the dread and Divine table, and to the sacred mystery, do it with fear and trembling. . . . Reflect what a Sacrifice thou art about to touch, what a table thou art going to approach! Think that thou, though but dust and ashes, dost receive Christ's Body and Blood. Were even a human king to invite thee to a banquet thou wouldst recline at table with fear and wouldst receive the food before thee reverently and silently; whilst when God invites thee to His own table and sets before thee His own Son—the heavenly powers standing around with fear and trembling, the cherubim hiding their faces, the seraphim crying out with dread, "Holy, Holy, Holy Lord"—dost thou approach with shouting and confusion to this spiritual banquet?' [1]

And again :[2]

'The angels standing round, this awful table lying before thee . . . Christ gives thee to partake of His Flesh.'

And again, explaining what had taken place during a public broil in a church :[3]

'The most holy Blood of Christ, as will happen in so great a tumult, was spilt upon the clothes of the soldiers.'

And, in the last citation which our limited time

[1] 'In Diem Nat. Jesu Christi,' n. 7, tom. ii., p. 430.
[2] 'De Bapt. Christi,' n. 4, tom. ii., pp. 441, 442.
[3] Epist. 1, 'Innoc.,' tom. iii., pp. 618, 619.

allows us to make, Chrysostom most emphatically explains that Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist are no mere figures, no empty symbols, but full reality.'[1]

'When thou seest the Lord *sacrificed* [during Mass] and lying on the altar, and the Priest standing and praying over the *Sacrifice*, and all the people reddened with the Precious Blood, thinkest thou that thou art yet among men, or dost thou not straightway remove to heaven, and casting forth from thy soul every carnal thought, with bared soul and pure mind, survey the things of heaven?

'O marvel! O love of God for man! He Who sitteth aloft with the Father is at this hour held in the hands of all, and giveth Himself to those who will, to enfold and to embrace.'

Here we end. We have adduced but a few of the thousands of testimonies to the Real Presence with which the pages of the Fathers of the first four centuries are profusely sprinkled. But we have done enough. From every part of the Christian world we have heard the concordant voices of all our witnesses declaring with bated breath that the consecrated bread is what Christ said it was—His Body; and that the consecrated wine is what Christ said it was —His Blood. Not a figure of His Body, but His very Body. Not a figure of His Blood, but His very Blood.

'My Flesh is true meat, and My Blood is true drink.'[2]

[1] 'De Sacerdotio,' tom. i., p. 382. [2] John vi. 55.

LECTURE XII

TESTIMONIES OF THE EARLY FATHERS TO TRANSUBSTANTIATION

In our last lecture we studied the testimonies of the Fathers of the first four centuries to the Real Presence. In the present lecture we shall study their testimonies to that particular mode by which the Real Presence is effected, called Transubstantiation.

We have already quoted the assertions of Leibnitz that 'Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence in many places simultaneously, do not differ from each other in their ultimate analysis'; and that 'the Real Presence and Transubstantiation are mutually contained in each other.'[1]

We have now to see how far the early Fathers take the same view as Leibnitz.

The word itself—Transubstantiation—as well as its Greek and Latin equivalents—*μετουσιασμός*, *Transubstantiatio* — is of comparatively modern origin. For, as we have pointed out in a previous lecture, the word seems to have come into use during the controversy with Berengarius in the eleventh

[1] 'Briefwechsel zwischen Leibnitz,' etc., pp. 145, 146.

century. But though the word itself is recent, we have to see what evidence there is in the first four centuries for the antiquity of the idea which the word accurately expresses.

The Council of Trent[1] says:

'Since Christ, our Redeemer, affirmed that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His Body, therefore it has ever been the belief of the Church of God, and this holy Synod now declares it afresh, that by consecration of bread and wine a change takes place of the whole substance of bread into the substance of the Body of Christ, our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the substance of His Blood. And this change is aptly and properly called, by the Holy Catholic Church, Transubstantiation.'

From this definition it is clear that Transubstantiation is a *change*. It is not the mode *in* which Christ sacramentally exists in the Eucharist; it is the mode of change *by* which He is made to exist sacramentally.

I

Having, from the Fathers, proved already the Real Presence, it is quite unnecessary to quote again the innumerable passages in which—as in Christ's own words when He instituted the Eucharist—the Eucharistic symbols are declared *to be* His Body and Blood. For if they *are* His Body and Blood, it is obvious that they *are not* bread and wine. Whence the inference is obvious that the substances

[1] Sess. xiii., cap. 4, Denzinger, n. 758.

of bread and wine have been *changed* into Christ's Body and Blood. And such change is nothing else but Transubstantiation. For on any other theory of a Real Presence, except that of Transubstantiation, the substances of bread and wine remain ; and, if they remain, they are not changed into Christ's Body and Blood.

II

The Fathers repeatedly assert that the bread and wine *are made* and *do become* (*ποιεῖσθαι, γενέσθαι, fieri*) the Body and Blood of Christ.

Now, if bread and wine are made, and do become, Christ's Body and Blood, they must, of necessity, cease to be bread and wine. But when a thing ceases to be what it was, and becomes something else which it before was not, it is said to be *changed* into that something else.

For instance, at the marriage feast of Cana of Galilee water ceased to be water and became wine. In Egypt, Moses' rod ceased to be a rod and became a serpent. The water was *changed* into wine. The rod was *changed* into a serpent. The water was *made into and became* wine. The rod was *made into and became* a serpent.

Among the Greek and Latin Fathers such language is of everyday use :

St. Irenæus (flourished 178) says :

'When the mingled cup and the created bread receive the Word of God, the Eucharist *becomes* [*γίνεται*] Christ's Body and Blood.'[1]

[1] 'Adv. Hæres.,' lib. v., n. 2, p. 293.

St. Ambrose (flourished 385) says:

'The consecration is added, and of the bread *is made* [fit] the Flesh of Christ.'[1]

'This Body, which we *make* [*conficimus*], is from a Virgin.'[2]

St. Jerome (flourished 385) says:

'Priests *make* [*conficiunt*] Christ's Body.'[3]

St. Chrysostom (flourished 387) says:

'It is not man that causes the oblations to *become* [γενέσθαι] Christ's Body and Blood . . . but the power and grace is of God.'[4]

The Prayer of Consecration in all the Liturgies of East and West is to the same effect.

Liturgy of St. James (Liturgy of Jerusalem):

'May the Holy Spirit sanctify and *make* [ποιήσῃ] this bread the holy Body of Christ.'

Liturgy of St. Mark (Liturgy of Alexandria):

'Send down upon these loaves and these cups Thy Holy Spirit, that He may *make* [ποιήσῃ] the bread indeed the Body,' etc.

Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (Liturgy of Constantinople):

'*Make* [ποίησον] this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ.'

Liturgy of St. Ambrose:

'Receive this holy bread that it may be *made* [*ut fiat*] the Body of Thine only-begotten Son.'

Coptic Liturgy:

[1] 'De Sacram.,' lib. iv., c. 4.
[2] 'De Myst.,' cap. ix., n. 53.
[3] Epist. xiv., 'Ad Heliodorum,' n. 8.
[4] Hom. 'De Perdit. Judæ,' n. 6.

'Change [the bread and wine], so that this bread may *become* Thy holy Body,' etc.

Syriac Liturgy:

'*Make* this bread the glorious Body of our Lord.'

Liturgy of St. Gregory:

'May the Holy Spirit *make* this bread *become* Thy holy Body.'

Æthiopian Liturgy:

'Send Thy Holy Spirit and power upon this bread and upon this chalice, and *make* them both the Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for ever and ever. Amen.'

III

The Fathers expressly recognise a *change* in the bread and wine. They affirm that the bread and wine are *changed* (*μεταβάλλονται, mutantur, convertuntur*) into the Body and Blood of Christ.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (flourished 363):

'Christ at Cana of Galilee *turned* [*μεταβέβληκεν*] water into wine. Is He undeserving of belief when He *turned* [*μεταβαλών*] wine into Blood?'[1]

'We call upon God to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the gifts which lie open to view, in order that He may *make* the bread Christ's Body and the wine Christ's Blood. For assuredly whatsoever the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and *changed* [*μεταβέβληται*].'

On this passage Waterworth[2] remarks that he has

[1] 'Catechesis Mystagogica,' iv., n. 2; Hurter, p. 117.

[2] 'Faith of Catholics,' ii., p. 435, note 1.

noticed this same word in only three other passages of St. Cyril besides those where the Eucharist is spoken of, and in these three places it expresses miraculous changes wrought by the sole power of God.

St. Ambrose:

'If the words of Elijah could call down fire from heaven, shall not Christ's word avail to *change* [*ut mutet*] the species of the elements?'

'Shall not Christ's word, which could draw out of nothing what was not, be able to *change* [*mutare*] that which was into what it was not?'[1]

We need not multiply our quotations. St. Ambrose compares the Eucharistic change to the change of Moses' rod into a serpent; of the Nile into blood; of bitter into sweet in the waters of Marah. St. Cyril of Jerusalem compares it to the change of water into wine at Cana of Galilee. St. Justin and Gregory compare it to the change of the food we eat into the substance of our body. St. John Chrysostom compares it to the change of the rains of heaven into the substance of the plants which they fertilize. And these changes are mostly expressed in Greek by *μεταβολή*.

IV

In very much the same sense, though with a variation of expression, the Fathers declare that the bread *passes into*, or *is converted into* (*μεθίστασθαι*, *μετασκευάζεσθαι*), the Body of Christ.

[1] 'De Mysteriis,' c. ix., n. 52; Hurter, p. 84.

St. Gregory of Nyssa (flourished 370):

'[The bread eaten by Christ during His life on earth] was sanctified by the indwelling of the Word, Who had His tabernacle in the Flesh. As, then, the bread, being *transmuted* [μεταποιούμενος] into that Body, *passed into* [μετέστη] Divine power, in like manner *the same taketh* place also here [in the Eucharist].[1]

St. Chrysostom:

'The works that lie before us are not of human power. He Who did these things at that supper, He also now effects the same. We hold the rank of ministers; but He it is that sanctifies and *transmutes* [μετασκευάζων] them.'[2]

V

There is another word, expressing almost the same idea, which seems peculiar to St. John Chrysostom—the word μεταρρυθμίζεσθαι (*transfigurari*):

'It is not man that makes the *oblata* to *become* [γενέσθαι] Christ's Body and Blood, but that same Christ that was crucified for us. The priest, fulfilling his office, stands pronouncing those words, but the power and grace are of God. He says: "*This is My Body.*" This word *transforms* [μεταρρυθμίζει] the *oblata*.'[3]

He uses the same word in the same context in the next homily on the same subject.

[1] 'Catachet. Oratio,' opera ii., p. 536.
[2] Tom. vii., Hom. 82; 'In Matt.,' n. i., 4-6, p. 891.
[3] Hom. i., 'De Prodit. Judæ,' n. 6.

St. Ambrose uses the Latin equivalent, *transfigurari:*

'But as often as we receive the Sacraments which, through the mystery of the sacred prayer, are *transformed* [*transfigurantur*] into the Body and Blood of Christ, so often do we show forth the death of the Lord.'[1]

'Thou believest that true flesh was assumed by Christ, and thou offerest His Body to be *transformed* on the altars [*offeras transfigurandum corpus altaribus*].'[2]

VI

The English language is incapable of expressing the minute shades of meaning which the flexibility of Greek renders easy. Consequently the following word has no precise equivalent in our own tongue, but it can be equivalently expressed by saying that the sacred symbols are *trans-elemented*—that is, the *elements* [στοιχεῖα] of bread and wine are *changed* [μεταστοιχειοῦνται] into the Body and Blood of Christ.

An instance of its use will illustrate its meaning. St. Cyril of Alexandria employs it to express the retransmutation of the serpent into Moses' rod.

St. Gregory of Nyssa treats of the Eucharist in chapter xxxvii. of his 'Great Catechetical Instruction,' addressed to the uninitiated. He writes:

'The Divine Word hath commingled Himself

[1] 'De Fide,' bk. iv., c. 10, n. 124.
[2] 'De Incarn.,' c. iv., n. 23.

with the weak nature of man, in order that, by partaking of the Divinity, our humanity may be deified. For this reason, by the dispensation of His grace, he entered by His Flesh into the breasts of the faithful, commingled and contempered with their bodies, that, by being united to that which is immortal, man may participate in incorruption. And this He grants by the power of the benediction, *trans-elementing* [μεταστοιχειώσας] the nature [φύσιν] of the visible symbols.'

VII

There is yet one other word which will admirably close our chain of evidence. This word, like the last, is a good instance of the copiousness and of the muscular collectedness of the Greek tongue. There is no word that can, even approximately, translate it, except the word coined to meet the heresy of Berengarius, the word 'transubstantiation.'

We have seen already that the Fathers again and again speak of the bread and wine *being made* the Body and Blood of Christ. But they go further, and affirm that they are *trans-made* (μεταποιοῦνται) —that is, are *made into a new substance;* that is, *are transubstantiated.*

And of the many words used by the Greek Fathers to express the same idea, probably there is none more common than this.

St. Gregory of Nyssa:

'The Body [of Christ] by the indwelling of the

God-Word was *transubstantiated* [μετεποιήθη][1] into the Divine dignity. Rightly, therefore, do I believe that now also [in the Eucharist] the bread, sanctified by God's Word, is *transubstantiated* [μεταποιεῖσθαι] into the Body of the God-Word.'[2]

The saint next draws a comparison between the change in the Incarnation and the change in the Eucharist. In both, he says, by Transubstantiation has bread passed into God.

First in the Incarnation. For Christ, as Man, during His mortal life ate and drank—that is, lived on 'bread,' in the generic sense of the term—and this 'bread' was assimilated into His Body, and His Body is the Body of God. Thus was bread transubstantiated into God. Secondly, in the Eucharist—though not by way of eating and drinking, but in an instant—bread, again, by the operation of the same Divine power, is changed into, or transubstantiated into, God. St. Gregory writes:[3]

'The Body of Christ was potentially bread [*i.e.*, because nourished on bread], but it was sanctified by the indwelling of the Word that tabernacled in the flesh.

'Hence, *whereby* the bread in that Body being *transubstantiated* [μεταποιηθείς], passed into a Divine power, *thereby* is the same thing effected now also [in the Eucharist].

'For not only did the grace of the Word then [*i.e.*, in Christ's natural Body] make holy a Body,

[1] In the Incarnation the substance of man's body became the substance of God's body.

[2] 'Orat. Catech. Magna.,' c. 37.

[3] *Ibid.*

the substance of which was bread, and which, in some sort, was itself bread; but now also [*i.e.*, in the Eucharist], in similar fashion, the bread, as the Apostle says, is sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer, for bread passes into the Body of the Word, not by being eaten and drunk, but by being instantly *transubstantiated* [μεταποιούμενος] into the Body of the Word, according as was said by the Word: "*This is My Body.*" '

St. Ambrose used the word *transfigurari* in the same sense. We take two instances, both of which we have quoted above:

'As often as we receive the sacraments [Eucharist] which, by the mystery of the sacred prayer, are *transubstantiated* (*transfigurantur*) into Flesh and Blood, we show forth the death of the Lord.'[1]

'Thou offerest His Body to be *transubstantiated* (*transfigurandum*) on the altars.'[2] Theodoret[3] quotes this latter passage, and translates '*transfigurandum*' by 'προς μεταποίησιν.'

VIII

With this outline sketch of the copious evidence at our disposal we close our case; but had we been less cramped for time, it would have been easy to have multiplied examples in all the classes, without at all stepping outside the limits of the first four centuries. But brief as our lecture has been, we have said enough to make it impossible for anyone to deny that the Primitive Church emphatically

[1] 'De Fide,' c. 10, n. 124.
[2] 'De Incarn.,' c. iv., n. 23.
[3] Dial. ii., 'Inconfusus.'

held, and clearly taught, Transubstantiation. No man with even a smattering of patristic learning can fail to see that the Catholic Church of the first four centuries not only defined the Real Presence, but also defined the mode by which the Real Presence is effected—Transubstantiation—that is, that after the Consecration the substances of bread and wine cease to exist, and that under the appearances, which remain, of bread and wine, Christ's Body and Blood, together with His Soul and Divinity, truly, really, and substantially exist, and are received by the communicant.

To recapitulate. With the copious vocabulary of the Greek language at their disposal, the Fathers of the first four centuries use a rich variety of phrases to convey the meaning of that particular substantial change which we technically and accurately call Transubstantiation. They declare that the sacramental symbols *are* the Body and Blood of Christ. They affirm that what *was* bread *has been made* into His Body. They define the mode by which this has been effected, and insist, against all the apparent evidence of the senses—on which they never fail to dwell—and prove by illustrations and examples—which have no meaning, except in the hypothesis of Transubstantiation—that the bread and wine are *changed* and *converted* into Christ's Body and Blood. They point out that in this change the bread and wine are *transformed*, *transmuted*, *transfigured*. They insist upon it that the *elements*, or *constituent parts*, of the bread and wine are changed into the elements, or constituent parts, of Christ's Body and Blood.

Lastly, to clinch the argument, and to make assurance doubly sure, they teach that the bread and wine are *trans-made*—that is, are *made into a new thing*, or, in the apt words of Catholic theology, are *transubstantiated*.

The strong intellect of Leibnitz grasped this truth. He saw that the Bible dogma of the Real Presence was possible only on the hypothesis of Transubstantiation:

'Transubstantiation, and the Real Presence in many places simultaneously, do not differ from each other in their alternate analysis. For it is impossible to conceive a body present in several separate places at the same time in any other way than by conceiving its substance to exist under different species'[1]

Then let us hear no more of the futile evasion that Transubstantiation presupposes the philosophy of Aristotle, and stands or falls with that philosophy. For it presupposes only the teaching of Christ, and stands or falls only with that teaching.

[1] *Loc. cit.*

LECTURE XIII

TWO EARLY FATHERS ON THE EUCHARIST

We have now discussed the views held by the Fathers of both East and West, during the first four centuries, concerning the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, and we have found that they all, and that most definitely and decidedly, held both the one and the other.

It may, however, be objected that we have proved our case only by picking out such quotations as fitted in with our preconceived views, and that, by a judicious choice of passages from the same writers, the Protestant opinion might have been equally well established.

To meet this objection, we propose to give *in extenso* all the arguments of two of the ancient Fathers in those parts of their writings from which we have already made extracts, so that you, my hearers, may judge for yourselves whether or not, in our past lectures, we have fully presented the views of these authors.

Moreover, we shall select two Fathers whose orthodoxy is above all suspicion, and who, therefore,

can be trusted to have set forth the ordinary and well-established tradition of the Catholic Church.

Nor shall we choose recondite or prolix treatises. On the contrary, let us take two short and popular works in which the writers whom we are about to quote plainly and briefly explain the current Catholic teaching for the everyday instruction of the 'man in the street.'

Now, there are two little works at hand which exactly suit our purpose, both of which may be had together for one shilling:[1] these are, a tiny pamphlet by St. Ambrose on the 'Mysteries of the Christian Religion'; and a sort of 'penny Catechism' by St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

Let St. Ambrose of Milan, then, speak for the West.

Let St. Cyril of Jerusalem represent the East.

I

St. Ambrose of Milan (flourished 385 A.D.):[2]

'Enriched with the adornments of grace, the newly baptized proceed to Christ's altars and break forth into these words: "Thou hast prepared a table before me" (Ps. xxii. 5).

'Let us now study that altar.

'The things that are invisible are not beheld, neither

[1] 'Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta,' edited, with commentaries, by H. Hurter, S.J., series i., vol. vii. 'Vita S. Ambrosii a Paulino, ejus notario conscripta. S. Ambrosii, S. Cyrilli Hieros. et Tertulliani Opuscula ad Ecclesiæ Sacramenta Pertinentia.' Price 1s., David Nutt, London.

[2] The 'Book about Mysteries' consists of nine brief chapters, the last two of which—the eighth and ninth—deal with the Holy Eucharist. These two chapters we here give almost in full (Hurter, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-94).

can the human eye perceive them. Hence a newly baptized, beholding only the things that are visible, may perchance complain thus: "For the Jews God rained down manna and quails. But for the Church of His love is this all that He has prepared? And yet of that same Church it has been said that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive what things God hath prepared for those who love Him!"'

'To remove this false idea, we propose now to prove thoroughly that the Sacraments of the Church are older than those of the Synagogue and are more excellent than the manna.

'They are *older* than the Synagogue.' For,[1] etc.

'The Sacraments are more *excellent* than the gift of manna.

'A marvellous thing it was, indeed, that God rained down manna for the Jews of old, and that they were fed with daily food from heaven. And because manna came down from heaven it was said that "men ate the bread of angels." And yet all who ate that bread died in the desert.

'But this food which thou receivest, this Living Bread that cometh down from heaven, supplies us with the substance of eternal life. And whosoever shall have eaten this Living Bread shall never die; and it is the Body of Christ.

'Consider now which is the more excellent, the bread of angels or Christ's Flesh. For the latter is, in truth, the body of life.

[1] This St. Ambrose proves, but as it does not affect our subject we omit this part.

'That manna came down from heaven; this is above heaven.

'That was of heaven; this is of the Lord of heaven.

'That was liable to corruption if preserved to another day; this is free from all corruption, and whosoever religiously tastes it cannot feel corruption.

'For the Jews, water flowed from a rock; for thee, Blood out of Christ. They were temporarily satiated with water; thy thirst is for ever quenched with Blood.

'The Jews drank and thirsted; thou, when thou hast drunk, canst not thirst.

'That was in a figure; this in verity. If, then, that which thou marvellest at is but a shadow, how great is that reality whereof the very shadow fills thee with wonder! That, then, was but a figure of this.

'You see, therefore, that what we have is more excellent than what the Jews had. Why? Because light is more excellent than shade, reality than figure, the Maker's Body than manna.

'But perhaps you will offer an objection and say: "What I see is not a body; how, then, do I receive the Body of Christ?"

'We have now to prove how you do.

'How many examples shall we make use of?

'This (the Eucharist) is not accomplished by the powers of Nature. It is consecrated by the words of blessing. Now the force of these words of blessing is greater than the force of Nature. For, by blessing, even Nature itself is changed. Take some instances:

'Moses held a rod; he cast it down; it became a serpent (Exod. iv. 3). Again, he took hold of the

tail of the serpent and it again became a rod. Thus you see that by prophetic grace the nature both of the serpent and of the rod was twice changed.

'Again, the rivers of Egypt ran with a pure stream of water. But suddenly from the veins of the fountains blood began to gush forth, and there was in the rivers no water to drink [Exod. vii. 20]. But at the prophet's prayer the blood ceased from the rivers, and the natural waters flowed again.

'Moreover, the Hebrew people were hemmed in on all sides—on one side by the Egyptians, like a rampart; on the other side by the sea. But Moses raised his rod, the waters separated, they hardened into seeming walls, and between the waves a footpath opened out [Exod. xiv. 21].

'Jordan turned back and flowed, contrary to Nature, back upon its source [Josh. iii. 16].

'Is it not, therefore, clear that the nature, both of the waves, and of the sea, and of the river's course, was changed?

'Take another instance: Moses touched the rock and water flowed from it [Exod. i. 7]. In that case did not grace effect what was above Nature; for did not the rock spout forth water which naturally it did not contain?

'Furthermore, the river Marah was very bitter, so that the thirsty people could not drink. But Moses threw wood into the water, and the water laid aside its bitterness [Exod. xv. 25].

'Take but one more example. Under Elisha the prophet [4 Kings vi. 6], the iron head was struck from the axe of one of the sons of the prophets and

forthwith sank in the water. Then he who lost it besought Elisha. The prophet thereupon threw a piece of wood into the water, and the iron swam. This, we are quite certain, was an effect superior to Nature, for iron is by nature heavier than water.

'Grace, then, we notice is stronger than Nature.

'But so far we have dealt with the grace imparted by the blessing of a human prophet.

'Now, if a human blessing thus availed to change Nature, what shall we say concerning the Divine consecration, in which the very words of the Lord our Saviour operate?

'For this Sacrament [of the Eucharist] which you receive is effected by the Word of Christ (*Christi sermone conficitur*).

'Nay, if Elijah's word so availed as to draw down fire from heaven, shall not Christ's word avail to change the natures of the elements?

'Concerning the making of the whole world, you have read that "He spoke, and it was done; He commanded, and it was created." Therefore Christ's word, potent to make out of nothing that which was not, cannot it change those things which are into that which they are not? For to give new natures to things is not less than to change their natures.

'But why use arguments? Let us use His own examples.

'By the example of the Incarnation let us establish the truth of the mystery [of the Eucharist]. Did the usual course of Nature precede when Jesus the Lord was born of Mary? If we look for that order,

the connection of man and woman is the natural thing. Therefore, it is obvious that the Virgin conceived in a manner superior to the order of Nature. And this Body [in the Eucharist] *which we* [priests] *make*[1] is from the Virgin. Why do you seek here [*i.e.*, in the Eucharist] the natural course of things in the Body of Christ when the Lord Jesus Himself was superior to nature, born of a virgin? Real beyond a doubt was Christ's Flesh that was crucified and buried. Really, therefore, is this [the Eucharist] the Sacrament of that Flesh.

'The Lord Jesus Himself cried out: "This is My Body." *Before* the blessing of heavenly words another nature is named; *after* the Consecration His Body is signified. He Himself declares it to be His own Blood. And you say, "Amen," which means, "It is true."[2] What the mouth speaks let the inward mind confess. What language expresses let the heart feel.

'With these Sacraments, then, with which the soul's substance is strengthened does Christ feed His Church. And with good reason, seeing how it advances in grace, does He say to her: "How beautiful are thy breasts, My Sister, My Spouse," etc. [Cant. iv. 10-12]. Whereby is signified that the

[1] 'Et hoc quod *conficimus* corpus ex virgine est.' That the priest by the words of consecration *makes* the Body of Christ is an expression common among the Fathers. St. Jerome (Epist. iv., 'Ad Heliodor.') said: 'Succeeding to the Apostolic rank, with their sacred mouth they *make* the Body of Christ (Apostolico gradui succedentes, Christi Corpus sacro ore *conficiunt*).'

[2] In the fourth century the faithful were wont at the moment of Consecration to say 'Amen' as a profession of faith in the Real Presence.

mystery must remain *sealed* within thee; not violated by the works of an evil life nor by the sullying of chastity, nor divulged to whom it ought not,[1] lest it be made known, by garrulous talkativeness, among the unbelieving. . . .' [Here we omit some moral reflections.]

'In that Sacrament there is Christ because there is Christ's Body. It is not, therefore, body, but spiritual, food.[2] Whence, also, the Apostle says of its *type* that "our fathers did eat a spiritual food and drank a spiritual drink" [1 Cor. x. 3]. For the Body of God is a spiritual Body; the Body of Christ is the Body of a Divine Spirit; because Christ is a Spirit as we read: "The spirit before my face, Christ the Lord" [Lam. iv. 20]. And in an Epistle of Peter we have it that "Christ died for us" [1 Pet. ii. 21].

'In conclusion, this food strengthens our heart, and this drink, as the prophet foretold, gladdens the heart of man' [Ps. ciii. 15].

II

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (died A.D. 386):

St. Cyril wrote about 347 a catechetical instruction for the newly baptized, in which he explains to them, what hitherto had been carefully concealed from them (according to the Discipline of the Secret), the doctrines of Confirmation and the Eucharist. Here we are concerned only with the

[1] He refers to the Discipline of the Secret.

[2] 'In illo sacramento Christus est, quia Corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca sed spiritualis.'

Fourth Homily of the Mystagogic Catechism, which Homily is entitled 'Concerning Christ's Body and Blood.'[1]

'For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you [1 Cor. xi. 23 *et seq.*].

'This teaching of St. Paul, even by itself, is sufficient to give you a full assurance concerning the Divine mysteries; of which, being now found worthy, ye have become one in body and one in blood with Christ.[2] For St. Paul has just proclaimed that "our Lord Jesus Christ, the same night in which He was betrayed, having taken bread and given thanks, broke and gave to His disciples, saying: Take, eat; this is My Body. And having taken the cup and given thanks, He said: Take, drink; this is My Blood" [1 Cor. xi. 23-25].

'Christ Himself, therefore, declared and said concerning the bread: "This is My Body." Henceforth, therefore, who shall dare to doubt?

'Christ Himself affirmed and said: "This is My Blood." Who, therefore, shall ever doubt, and say: "This is *not* His Blood"?

'Christ once at Cana of Galilee turned water into wine, which is akin to blood. Is He, then, undeserving of belief when He turned wine into His Blood? Invited to an earthly marriage, He wrought this stupendous miracle; shall we not, then, confess that on the children of His bridal chamber He all the more gave for their use His own Body and Blood?

[1] Hurter, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-122.

[2] 'Concorporei et consangues Christi facti estis.'

'Wherefore, with full assurance, let us partake, as it were, of Christ's Body and Blood. For in the type of bread[1] is given to you the Body, and in the type of wine is given to you the Blood, in order that, having partaken of Christ's Body and Blood, you may become one in body and one in blood with Him.[2] For thus are we made Christ-bearers, His Body and Blood being diffused through our members. Thus, in the words of blessed Peter, "do we become sharers of the Divine Nature" [2 Pet. i. 4].

'Christ, on one occasion discoursing with the Jews, said [John vi. 54]: "Unless ye eat My Flesh and drink My Blood, ye have not life in you." But they, from not taking His words spiritually, were scandalized, and went back, thinking that He invited them to eat raw flesh.[3]

'There were, even in the Old Covenant, loaves of proposition. These, however—since they belonged

[1] *I.e.*, under the appearance of bread. The Eucharist is a type or figure or symbol of Christ's Body—not of His absent, but of His present yet hidden Body. In this case the type contains what it typifies. A similar type was that of the fiery tongues which appeared over the Apostles on Pentecost Day—types, not of the absent, but of the present Holy Spirit.

[2] Literally, 'Ye may become the concorporeals and consanguineals of Christ.'

[3] Cyril accuses the Jews, not that they did not spiritually eat, but that they did not *spiritually understand.* They understood a Capharnaitic eating of raw flesh, instead of that true and real, but at the same time *sacramental,* eating of Christ's Flesh hidden under sacramental 'types' or veils. Christ's words were to be understood spiritually — that is, sacramentally — of an eating that fed the soul rather than the body, because Christ's Flesh is the Flesh of God.

to the Old Covenant—have come to an end. But in the New Testament there is a heavenly bread, there is a saving cup, and these sanctify both soul and body. For as the bread is suitable to the body, so also is the Word appropriate to the soul.

'Wherefore contemplate the bread and wine not as bare and common elements? For we have the Lord's declaration that they are Christ's Body and Blood. Therefore, even should thy sense-perception suggest this to thee, that they are bare symbols—nevertheless, let thy faith make thee certain and unwavering. Judge not the thing from the taste. But from faith be assured beyond a shadow of doubt that you have been dowered with the dowry of Christ's Body and Blood.

'The force of this fact David shall explain, saying: "Thou hast prepared in my sight a table over against those who afflict me" [Ps. xxii. 5]. Now, this is his meaning: "Before Thy coming demons prepared for men a table — foul, polluted, full of devilish power. But after Thy coming, O Lord, Thou hast prepared a table in my sight."

'When the man says to God, "Thou hast prepared a table in my sight," what else does he mean but the mystic and intellectual[1] table which God has prepared "over against"—*i.e.*, contrary and opposed to the demons? And this is rightly said; for that table had fellowship with demons; this table, however, has fellowship with God.

[1] Νοητήν—*i.e.*, understood by the mind, though not by the senses.

'"Thou hast anointed my head with oil" [Ps. xxii. 5]. With oil he anointed thy head upon the brow[1] by means of the seal of God which you have on you, in order that you may become the impression of the seal, the holiness of God.

'"And Thy chalice, which inebriateth me, how goodly it is!" [Ps. xxii. 5]. Thou seest here that cup spoken of which, having taken into His hands, and given thanks, Jesus said: "This is My Blood, which is shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 28).

'Therefore Solomon also, meaning this grace, says in Ecclesiastes [ix. 7, etc.]: "Come, eat thy bread in joy" (*i.e.*, spiritual bread. "Come"; he calls with a saving and a blissful calling). "And drink thy wine with a good heart"—the spiritual wine. "And let oil be poured upon thy head." (Do you see how he alludes even to the mystic chrism?) "And at all times let thy garments be white, because thy works have pleased God." For before you came to the grace of Baptism, your works were vanity of vanities [Eccles. i. 2]. . . .

'These things having learnt, and being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread (even though sensible to the taste), but Christ's Body; and that what seems wine is not wine (even though it seems wine to the taste), but Christ's Blood; and that of this David spoke of old in the Psalms

[1] This anointing of the forehead was after Baptism. In the Greek Church this anointing was not confined to the brow, but was over the whole body (*cf.* Catech. Mystag., ii., n. 3).

[ciii. 15], saying: "Bread strengtheneth the heart of man that he may make the face cheerful with oil" — do thou strengthen thy heart, partaking of that bread as spiritual, and make the face of thy soul cheerful. And may it be that, having your face unveiled by a pure conscience, ye may behold the glory of the Lord as in a glass, and advance from glory to glory, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be honour and might and glory for ever and ever. Amen.'

LECTURE XIV

CORPUS CHRISTI

I

To-day we keep the Festival of Christ's Flesh, the Feast of Corpus Christi. Not the Feast of Christ's Soul, nor of His Personality, nor of His Divinity, but of His Flesh. Conjointly, indeed—or, as theologians say, concomitantly—we also honour our Lord's Soul and Personality and Divinity. Nevertheless, this Festival is primarily the Festival of His Flesh.

To-day we adore the Flesh of Christ under a twofold aspect. First, because it is God's Flesh. Secondly, because it is man's Food.

First, then, the Flesh of Christ is the Flesh of God. When our Lord was teaching the Jews the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament, He commended His Body to them, not merely because it was the Temple of the Holy Ghost, not merely because it was the Sanctuary of Divinity, not merely because it was the Masterpiece of the Divine Hands, but because it was God's Flesh.

St. John, too, in that great dogmatic chapter,

the first of his Gospel, in describing the Incarnation of God, does not say that the Word became Man, or that the Word was united to a spiritual and intelligent nature, but that the 'Word became Flesh.'

Thus it is absolutely true to say that the flesh of man became the Flesh of God. The Flesh of Christ is a substantial part of that Whole which is God.

The Flesh of Christ is the Flesh of God, and therefore we pay to the Flesh of Christ precisely the same honour which we pay to God. The Flesh of Christ we worship with *Latreia*. To deny that the Flesh of Christ deserves Divine honour, and is to be worshipped with *Latreia*, is to be a Nestorian, and is to cease to be a Christian.

Secondly, the Flesh of Christ is not only God's Flesh, it is also man's Food. For our Lord said [John vi. 56]: 'My Flesh is true Meat.' The Flesh of Christ, substantially united with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity into the unity of one Divine Being, is the Food of man's soul. Just as under the Old Law manna from heaven was the miraculous food of man's body, so under the New Law the Flesh of Christ is the miraculous Food of man's soul.

We shall perhaps penetrate deeper into the meaning of to-day's Feast if we dwell for a moment on the likeness between the Jewish manna of the Old Law and Christ's Flesh, the Christian Manna of the New Law. We are told in the Book of Exodus [xvi. 13] that, on behalf of the Israelites in the desert, manna was rained down from heaven like a refreshing

dew upon the ground; and, again, under the self-same image of dew, the prophet Isaiah foretells the coming of Christ: 'Drop down dew, ye heavens, from above, and let the clouds rain the Just' [Isa. xlv. 8]. The Jewish manna came down from heaven to earth day by day; and, again, by the consecration of the priest in Holy Mass, Christ the Christian Manna comes down from heaven day by day upon our altars. The Jewish manna was kept as a treasure in a golden vase in the Tabernacle [Exod. xvi. 34]; Christ the Christian Manna is kept as a treasure in a vessel of gold in the tabernacle. The parallelism, too, is clear when the Book of Exodus [xvi. 31] describes the Jewish manna as 'white, and the taste thereof was like wafers made with honey.' Nor is the analogy less obvious when the Book of Wisdom [xvi. 20] says of manna that it had in it all that is delicious and the sweetness of every taste.' Moreover, the Jewish manna had this remarkable property that, though the people gathered it in apparently varying quantities, yet all found, and always, that in reality they had the same quantity—not more, not less; for, as the Book of Exodus [xvi. 18] informs us, 'neither had he more that had gathered more, nor did he find less that had provided less.' And is not this, too, the property of the Holy Eucharist, that no matter how many receive it, and no matter how large or how small the 'host' which they receive, each receives the whole living and undivided Body of Christ—not more, not less? Therefore it is that Holy Church sings in the Mass of to-day:

'Sumit unus, sumunt mille,
Quantum isti, tantum ille.'

'This Food now one, now thousands, claim,
Yet each and all receive the same.'

Again, the manna of the Old Law was given to sustain the Israelites during their forty years of wandering in the desert of Sinai; the Manna of the New Law is given to sustain Christians during the three score years and ten of their earthly pilgrimage through the desert of human life. Both mannas are celestial in their origin. Both are 'bread from heaven.' Both are 'bread of angels.' Not, however, in the same sense. The Psalmist [lxxvii. 24] says of the Jewish manna: 'God rained down manna and gave the bread of heaven. Man ate the bread of angels.' But the Jewish manna is here called 'the bread of heaven' and 'the bread of angels' in a figurative sense. The Jews, indeed, in our Lord's time, seem, in their carnal way, to have understood literally these symbolical expressions of the Old Testament. Just as the pagans of Greece and Rome had their legends about the banquets of their Gods—feasts of nectar and ambrosia—so the Jews imagined that the manna of their forefathers had literally come down from heaven, and had really been the food of angels. Therefore, when the Jews said to Christ: 'Moses gave bread from heaven to eat' [John vi. 31], our Lord corrected this gross notion and said: 'Moses gave you *not* bread from heaven' [John vi. 32]. In the Old Testament the manna in the desert was primarily called 'bread from heaven,' because it was a type and symbol of 'the true Bread from heaven'

[John vi. 32], which is the Flesh of Christ. In a secondary sense, however, the ancient manna was called 'bread from heaven,' because it came down from the skies as hailstones come down from the skies, and because it fell upon the ground as snow-flakes fall upon the ground. And in a secondary sense, too, the ancient manna was called the 'bread of angels,' because it was such food as angels, if they needed food, would eat. But the Christian Manna is 'the true Bread from heaven,' and 'the true Bread of angels.' The Flesh of Christ is 'true Bread from heaven,' because it is the Flesh of Him Who is always in heaven, in that real heaven where God for ever dwells. And the Flesh of Christ is 'the true Bread of angels,' because when men eat the Flesh of Christ they feed spiritually on that same Divinity which constitutes the happiness of angels and sustains the angelic life of unending bliss.

The last analogy we need touch on between the two mannas is this, that both were life-sustaining. The ancient manna, however, sustained the life only of the body; the Christian Manna sustains the life of the soul. Our Lord said, therefore, to the Jews: 'Your fathers did eat manna in the desert and are dead. I am the Living Bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of *this* Bread, he shall live for ever' [John vi. 49-52]. And again: '*This* is the Bread which came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead. He that eateth *this* Bread shall live for ever' [John vi. 59]. The ancient manna was but dead food that sustained only for a brief span the temporal life of man's death-

doomed body. But the new Manna is Living Food that preserves both soul and body to eternal life. To man's body the new Manna gives eternal life; because, through the eating of Christ's Body the body of the faithful communicant shall rise again to eternal glory. To man's soul, too, the new Manna gives eternal life, since on St. Paul's words [Eph. v. 30] it incorporates us with God, it makes us 'members of God's Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones' [Eph. v. 30], so that if a man eat of it worthily 'he shall not die' [John vi. 50].

II

Corpus Christi! The Body of Christ! How wonderful is the Blessed Sacrament! The name 'manna' was given to the miraculous food in the desert from the exclamation of surprise with which the Jews first greeted it. Full of astonishment when they first saw it, they cried 'Manhu!' which means 'What is this?' [Exod. xvi. 15]. And well, too, may we, as we contemplate the Blessed Sacrament, the Body of Christ under sacramental veils, cry out in amazement, 'Manhu?—What is this?' For of all the states of abasement to which love for this minute creature, man, has reduced the Immense and Mighty God, this assuredly is the lowest of all, this in which He makes Himself to be the Food of man. When the Creator of the universe stripped Himself of His Divinity to clothe Himself in the rags of our humanity; when, in the language of St. Paul [Phil. ii. 7], God 'emptied Himself, taking the form

of a slave, being made in the likeness of men and in habit found as a man,' surely that was humiliation deep enough. Nevertheless, though in the Incarnation the Infinite became finite, though the Deathless became subject to death, though the Immense became measurable by space and the Eternal measurable by time, though a Divine Being became human and God became man, still God did not thereby put off all signs of Divinity. For though God was born in poverty, yet a miraculous star announced His birth. Though God was born in a stable, yet at His nativity mystic light flooded the heavens, and angel choirs chanted 'Glory be to God in the Highest!' Though God was born amid brute beasts, yet foreign Kings came from afar to adore Him as their Lord. Though God lived for thirty years the obscure life of a village workman, yet on Thabor the rays of His Divinity shone through the walls of His mortal flesh until His garments gleamed like driven snow, so that the three Apostles who witnessed it fell flat on their faces—breathless, astonied—and babbled incoherently like men beside themselves. Again, if among the Jews Jesus did not appear to be all that He was, still none could deny that He was more than He appeared to be. Unassuming He was, yet His speech was 'as of one having authority' [Matt. vii. 27]. Often He was silent, yet when He opened His lips His bitterest enemies declared that 'He spake as man never spake before' [John vii. 46]. He shrank from publicity, yet countless miracles stamped Him as Lord of Nature and Master of the world. So that St. John, though he chronicles the

fact that the 'Word became Flesh' [John i. 14], yet adds that men saw His glory: 'We saw His glory, the glory, as it were, of the Only-Begotten of the Father' [John i. 14]. Nay, even when God 'had humbled Himself unto death, even to the death of the Cross' [Phil. ii. 8]; even when God was dying like a felon on a gibbet, His grace gone, His beauty beaten out of Him, the very likeness of manhood all but stamped and trampled out of Him, so that, in the language of the astonished Psalmist [xxi. 7], 'He had become as a leper, nay, as a worm and no man'—even then, from God in His death-throes, there burst forth manifestations of Divinity not less splendid than when, in anger, His vengeful fires blotted out the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrha; not less terrible than when, in wrath, He laid a heavy hand upon the people of Egypt and their King. For when Christ our God was dying on the Cross, the smoke of His Blood mounted up to heaven; it curtained the skies, it shut out the noontide, it quenched the midday sun. When God was dying on the Cross, the earth—under the weight of that Cross—reeled and staggered; the rocks split with noise like thunder; the great veil of the Jewish Temple was rent in twain from top to bottom; graves yawned; and dead men, living again, flitted through the sacred city to proclaim the Divinity of Him Who, thief-like, was dying on the Cross. Christ in His death hour filled the world with dread. When the life was ebbing forth from Him, at the very moment when He ceased to be, the God-Man proved Himself to be as powerful, as mighty, as terrible as

ever, and His direst enemies, in the very hour of His seeming defeat and of their own apparent triumph, grew pale at the spectacle of One Who began to reign as a King at the very moment when He ceased to live as a Man. Christ, the Omnipotent God, died in torment and disgrace, and yet in the dying Man His enemies were forced to recognise the High God, and to confess with the Roman centurion: 'Truly this Man was the Son of God' [Matt. xv. 19].

But turn now to the Blessed Sacrament. How different is God there! This Mighty Maker of the universe; this Master of angels and of men; this King of Kings and Lord of Lords; this Jesus, fairest of the children of men, Who was clad with gracefulness as with a garment—what eye so keen that can discern His Divinity, that can discover His Humanity, beneath the white vesture of the Sacred Host? He is the Boundless God, Whom the heavens and the earth cannot hold; yet He is enclosed within the tiny circlet of a wafer of bread. He is the Everlasting God, Whose splendours lit up the unthinkable centuries of eternity, Who always was and Who will never cease to be; yet day by day He is born again, day by day He dies again, upon this altar and upon every altar in Christendom. He is the Self-Sufficing God—free, independent, wanting nothing; yet He submits Himself to the will of man, He obeys the summons of His priest, at the bidding of His minister He comes down from heaven to earth, and hides Himself beneath the pall of bread; He conceals Himself beneath the mantle of wine!

Truly, if in the Incarnation 'God emptied Him-

self,' in the Blessed Sacrament He effaces Himself.

In the Incarnation, it is true, God put on the weakness of man; yes, but man put on the strength of God. The Crib and the Cross, it is true, showed us a God become Man; yes, but they also showed us a Man become God. In the Eucharist, however, Christ not only does not look like God, He does not even look like man. There, not only has God hidden His Divinity, He has also hidden His Humanity. In the Blessed Sacrament God has 'emptied Himself' into the likeness of a wafer of bread. Of old the pagans worshipped deities deaf and dumb: gods that had eyes, yet saw not; ears, yet heard not; mouths, yet spoke not. And in the Sacrament of the altar God has so humbled Himself as, to the outer eye, to resemble these sham divinities who were without thought, without will, without life, without motion, helpless, inert, dead.

I say 'to the outer eye.' Aye, but only to the outer eye. For be not deceived. This motionless God is in energetic action, though you see it not. This silent God is working stupendous prodigies, though you perceive it not. Day by day He is bringing about on this very altar a miracle that overtops all the forces of Nature. He is changing on the instant the substance of bread into the Divine Body and Blood, and the substance of wine into the Divine Blood and Body. And what a change this is! You cannot understand it. It surpasses the ken of your mind. It is not mutation. It is not adduction. It is not creation. It has no

parallel in Nature or beyond Nature, and therefore to express it accurately theology has had to coin a word—the word 'transubstantiation.'

Transubstantiation, then, is a miracle on quite a different footing from our Lord's other miracles. Other miracles He worked to prove His Godhead, to scatter the cloud that obscured His Divinity, to lead men to adore in the Man Christ Jesus, Whom their eyes saw and their hands handled, the Omnipotent God, Whom their hands could not reach and their eyes could not behold. Our Lord said to the Jews: 'If you will not believe Me, at least believe My works, for they give testimony of Me' [John v. 36, x. 25]. But the miracles that cluster round the Blessed Sacrament not only hide His Divinity, they also eclipse His Humanity. The Incarnation effaced in Him the likeness of God. But the Blessed Sacrament effaces in Him the likeness of man also. So far from these Eucharistic miracles helping to believe in the Real Presence, they are stones of stumbling in the way of that belief. Therefore in the Holy Eucharist God is exerting unlimited power; yet the more power He puts forth the less does He appear. Nay, He actually puts forth His power that He may not appear. For the miracles of the Eucharist deceive our senses. What we believe is the opposite of what we see. Natural evidence must be corrected by supernatural revelation.

As, then, the Blessed Sacrament is the masterpiece of God's power, so is it also the crowning effort of His love. For God has thus exerted His

power that He might express His love. God has thus put forth His power that He might 'empty Himself' the more; and He has emptied Himself the more that He might become the Food of the world. The measure of God's abasement in the Blessed Sacrament is the measure of His love for man. And as that abasement is the deepest, so is His love for man most profound. Well, then, may Holy Church call the Blessed Sacrament 'the Sacrament of Love.'

III

We all remember, when King David fetched from the city of Cariathiarim the Ark of God, which contained in a vessel of gold some of the manna whereon the Jews had fed in the desert [2 Kings vi.]—we all remember with what pomp and circumstance the great procession was ordered. There were met the Priests and Levites clad in ceremonial robes. There were mustered the chief men, the magistrates and ancients of the people. There were marshalled King David and his court of brave warriors who had won for him his throne. There were assembled vast multitudes of both sexes, of all ages, of all ranks and conditions in life, all that posterity of Abraham, countless as the stars of a winter-night firmament. There the nation of the Jews was gathered together to honour that Ark of the Covenant wherein, among other treasures, the golden cup of manna was kept. There every kind of instrument made joyous music. The mountains and valleys resounded with solemn hymns and canticles. The blood of untold victims

bedewed the earth. The smoke of fragrant incense from innumerable censers mounted up to the skies. And King David and his people danced in glad procession before the Ark, and they made this boast: 'There is none other nation so great as ours, so as to have gods nigh unto them, even as our God is present with us.'

Yet if God was nigh unto the Jews, how much nearer beyond comparison is He unto us Catholics! The Ark of the Covenant was but a type. The tabernacle wherein the Ark was guarded was but a figure. The golden vase of manna was but a symbol. Nevertheless, when this type, this figure, this symbol, was carried in triumphal procession in the midst of the twelve tribes of Israel, they boasted that God dwelt among them as He dwelt among no other nation. But we Catholics possess, not the promise, but the fulfilment; not the shadow, but the substance; not the type, but the reality. In bodily presence God abides among us. Corporally God dwells in our midst. We Catholics have communion with God. We are of God's inner circle. We are intimate with God. We are God's familiar friends. At any hour of the day or night we can go into God's presence, to converse with God, to praise God, to thank God, to complain to God, to expostulate with God, to petition God, to seek for consolation and sympathy and love from God.

And not only may we go to God, but God also comes to us. When we are well, He comes into our hearts to bless us. When we are ill, He comes to our sick-room to comfort us. Well, then, may we

cry, marvelling, like those Jews of old: 'Manhu?—What is this?' Well, too, may we exclaim: 'What nation is there like unto us Catholics, who day and night have in our midst the Bodily Presence of the Mighty God!'

IV

To-day, on this Feast of Corpus Christi, there is to be another procession; a procession more glorious than was of old that of King David's; a procession in which will be borne, not the Jewish, but the Christian Manna; not the Ark of the Lord, but the Lord Himself. This Ark, the outward symbol of God's covenant with the Jewish Church, was followed in procession by the one nation of the Jews. To-day the Blessed Sacrament, the outward symbol of God's covenant with the Christian Church, will be followed in procession by every nation on the face of the earth. From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, on this Corpus Christi day, one grand hymn of praise from 250,000,000 Catholic hearts is going up in mighty chorus to the great white throne of Christ. In Catholic lands to-day thousands of gorgeous processions are winding their way through college and convent, through cloister and cathedral, through city and country village; with priests in rich vestments, and religious in picturesque habits, and multitudinous people in holiday attire. And there are countless altars decked with choicest ornaments, and ablaze with starry lights, and perfumed with spring flowers, and fragrant with clouds of curling incense. And the

hearts of the worshippers are attuned to the scene, and throb in unison with the tumult of organs and the clash of orchestras and the chanting of choirs. And flags are floating in the breeze; and there is pealing of bells, and clash of arms, and roar of cannon from fortress heights. And why? Because to-day is the triumph of Jesus Christ. To-day the Catholic Church wills to proclaim her gratitude for God's great gift; to publish abroad the boon she has received; to display to all eyes for God's honour and glory the Blessed Sacrament, wherein are contained all the treasures of love, all the riches of mercy; the Blessed Sacrament which is the triumph of faith over sight, of spirit over matter, of grace over nature, of the Church over the world; the Blessed Sacrament wherein 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' [Col. ii. 9].

To-day, then, Holy Mother Church invites all her children to share in her own transports of joy. She says in effect:

'Come forth, ye sons and daughters of Sion, come forth and see the King of Kings, crowned with the diadem wherewith His Spouse, the Catholic Church, hath crowned Him. Come and see Him Who has ennobled you, for He has raised you to the level of God. Come and see Him Who has enriched you, for He has filled you with the treasures of Divinity. Come and bow your heads and bend your knees and bate your breath, as enthroned in jewelled monstrance of gold, carried under silken canopy, borne aloft by consecrated hands, there passes by, scattering blessings on your head, the great High

Priest, the Omnipotent Master of life and of death; the Maker and Lord of heaven and of earth; He who beareth the government of the world upon His shoulders; He Whose Name is the Wonderful, the Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace; He, your Creator, your Saviour, your Father, your Friend, your Lover.

'Yes, Him come and see. And when He passes by you, kneel in adoring awe, and try to realize and appreciate His beauty, His sweetness, His goodness, His love, His nearness.'

'Him come and see,' the Church seems to say, 'all ye that fear God, and I will show you what great things my Spouse hath done unto me. Come, let us together adore the Lord, and praise Him with gladness. Let us sing joyfully to God our Saviour. Let us come before His presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise to Him with psalms. For the Lord is a great God, and a great King above all gods. For in His hands are all the ends of the earth, and the heights of the mountains are His. For the sea is His, and He made it; and His hands formed the dry land.

'Come, let us adore, and fall down, and weep before the Lord that made us. For He is our God, and we are His people. To-day, if you shall hear His voice, harden not your hearts' [Ps. xciv.].

To-day let not that text be true of us, as it is true of the heretical and unbelieving world round about us [John i. 26]: '*There has stood One in the midst of you Whom you know not.*'

LECTURE XV

THE SACRAMENT OF LOVE

'WHAT a piece of work is man!' wrote our national dramatist in his greatest tragedy.

'What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God!'

Yet is there not a fatal flaw in the moral and intellectual mechanism of man? For man is but a finite being, yet he is consumed with an unquenchable thirst for the Infinite. Man has but a limited capacity for happiness, yet he is famished with an insatiable hunger for the Unlimited. Only the Infinite, only the Unlimited can fill man's narrow human heart. Nothing short of infinite truth can satisfy the strivings of man's finite intellect. Nothing short of infinite beauty can still the cravings of man's finite will. Nothing short of limitless goodness can calm man's passionate eagerness to love and to meet with love. Nothing less than the possession of God can pacify man, nothing finite, nothing fleeting, nothing created.

Was not that the meaning of the Wise Man of

old? He had all that the world could give; wealth and honour and power; incomparable wisdom; whatever his eyes desired he denied them not, and his heart he withheld not from tasting every pleasure; yet when he had enjoyed it all, he still thirsted for something higher, he still hungered for something nobler, until at last, from his desolate heart, there went tingling up to the cold stars that bitter, bitter confession that it was all emptiness: 'Vanity of vanities, and all, all is vanity; vanity and vexation of spirit!'

Was not that the meaning of the great-souled Augustine when he turned with weariness from the sordid things of earth, and clamoured to the High God: 'My heart, O God, was made for Thee, and it can find no rest till it rest in Thee'?

Was not that the meaning of the Royal Psalmist when he sang: 'As the hart panteth after the fountains of living water, so doth my soul long for Thee, O my God. My soul is athirst for the strong living God'?

And was not that, too, the meaning of the epic poet of ancient Greece when, melancholy in his ignorance of God, he sadly sang: 'Of all creatures the most unhappy is man'?

Man, therefore, is ever aspiring to an object out of all proportion to his being. Man, climbing the steep and stony heights of human life, is ever clambering to reach an object infinitely above and beyond him. Man, whether he is conscious of it or not, is ever clutching at that infinite good, which is God.

Is not that in man a moral and an intellectual defect?

The world, from the beginning, has felt the force of this difficulty, and has ever done its best to arrange human life without reference to God. Man, from the beginning, has tried hard to escape from this essential exigence of his nature, and century after century has engaged in the quest of a created substitute for God. Man, from the beginning, has striven to achieve happiness without God. But his attempt has been fruitless, his quest unsuccessful. Again and again nations have forgotten God. Time after time nations have debased the idea of God. But never yet has a man found it tolerable to live without God. Never yet has anything undivine sufficed to slake man's maddening thirst for God. Man's misdirected efforts after happiness have often ended in degradation; they have never ended in satisfaction.

It is, I repeat, a law of man's nature that he shall, whether he will or not, strive for the possession of that infinite good, which is God. Study man as he was in the past, or as he is in the present, and ever you will find him yearning for an object which, be he conscious of it or not, is always God.

To seek for union with God is, therefore, man's inevitable destiny. Now, this irresistible tendency towards the Infinite, apparently so out of proportion with man's finite being, who has implanted it in human nature? Who has made man's heart so large, so capacious, so noble, so ambitious? You will, of course, reply, that the author of this tendency

is God Himself. But your answer does but push back the difficulty one step further.

For, let us ask, does God love man, or does He not? If, on the one hand, you confess that God does not love man, then man's craving for God can never be satisfied, and thus his tendency to the Infinite is a fatal flaw in human nature, a flaw which renders human happiness a tantalizing impossibility. If God does not love you, perfect happiness can never be yours, search for it where you will, either in the heavens above or in the earth beneath.

And if, on the other hand, you maintain that God does love man, is not the latter alternative less intelligible, less within the grasp of reason than the former? For why should God love Man? Why should God love such a thing as I am? That God should punish my sins with endless fire I partly understand; but that He should love me! Tell me that God feels towards me mercy, or compassion, or benevolence, or pity; tell me that God cherishes for me such feelings as I entertain for the wounded hound which a passing waggon has bruised and mangled; tell me that these are God's sentiments for me, and again I partly understand you. For man is the creation of God, and we may fairly conceive how the Divine Artificer Who fashioned us feels for His handiwork that interest which the artist feels for the picture he has painted, which the sculptor feels for the statue he has carved, which the potter feels for the pitcher he has moulded. But that God should love me, can I understand that?

For consider what love implies. Requited love perfects happiness. Rejected love destroys happiness. Yet how can God's happiness be either perfected or destroyed by the proffer or the refusal of man's love? From all eternity God has been happy with the very plenitude of happiness, full of bliss unchanged, unchanging, and unchangeable. God was boundlessly happy before any created thing existed, and in happiness unmarred God would live on, though every created thing, even the whole universe, on the instant sank back into primeval nothingness. Why, therefore, should God love me, if His happiness the concession of my love cannot increase, nor the denial of my love diminish?

There might seem, then, to be no motive why God should care for man.

Nay, even given such a motive, think how impossible seem the conditions of love between God and man.

For first, true love supposes a knowledge of mutual affection in lover and beloved. A love unconscious of return cannot last. It flickers out from want of fuel to feed on. It is blighted by want of knowledge. Yet how is man to know that God loves him; man, the creature of a day, the hotbed of sin, the heir of death; God, the All-pure, the All-powerful, the Everlasting?

Secondly, love implies a mutual communication of goods, a partnership in property, between the lover and the beloved. Yet what has man to give God which God does not already possess? What has man to offer God which does not already belong to

God? For man has received all that he has, even the very fibre of his being, even the very breath of his nostrils, as a free gift from God.

Thirdly, love requires equality of lover and beloved. The sentiment entertained by one in a higher station for another of a lower rank must of necessity have in it some admixture of condescension, and condescension is fatal to true love. Yet what equality can there be between God and man? What can possibly bridge over the gulf between the temporal and the eternal, between the finite and the infinite? God's chattel I am. His slave I may be. But how can I be God's equal?

Finally, and most of all, the fourth condition of true love is union of minds and hearts. Lover and beloved must be knit together into one mind, must be welded together into one heart. They must be as one soul in two bodies. Each must be to the other an *alter ego*, a second self. In that ancient type, that beautiful model of perfect love, the friendship of David and Jonathan, Scripture tells us that the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved David as his own soul; and David in return loved Jonathan with a love that was wonderful, passing the love of woman.

Yes, love requires intimate union of hearts. You see this in the beautiful love of mother and child. Part mother and child for long, stretch wide seas between them, and what before was bliss and contentment is changed by separation into anguish and repining. Nor does the tranquil happiness of love return till once again they are united in closest union,

till once again they tread the paths of life together, hand in hand, and heart to heart.

The union of minds and of hearts is the very quintessence of love. And yet what union is possible between mortal man and the immortal God; between the child of earth, the heir of dusty death, and the Ever-Living God Whom man may not naturally look upon and live? You cannot yoke together light and darkness. You cannot link together fire and snow. You cannot bind together life and death.

These, then, are the four essential conditions of love. First, the knowledge of mutual affection in lover and beloved. Secondly, the mutual communication of goods. Thirdly, equality. And fourthly, the mutual union of minds and hearts.

Here, therefore, is the problem with which we are face to face. On the one hand, happiness is impossible for man unless he loves God, and is in return loved by God. Yet, on the other hand, the love of God for man would appear to be not less impossible. God, it might seem, cannot love man. He has no need of man's love. He has no motive to ask for man's love. And even if God needed my love, and had a motive to ask for my love, the conditions of love between man and God seem impracticable.

And yet, in spite of all these apparent impossibilities, it is an undeniable fact, it is a magnificent truth, that God does love us with most intense love. This expansion of the wings of the human mind, this soaring of the human soul towards God, is no defect in human nature. Defect! Nay, it is proof positive of the nobility of the spirit that is working in man.

God Himself it was Who implanted in the human heart this desire for divinity and made its fulfilment possible. Yes, God really wants our love. That is the strange fact which should make us cry out in amazement. That is the startling truth which should cast us on our knees, our foreheads to the pavement, to grovel at the feet of the Mighty God. God wants our love! There is the crowning mystery, that the Eternal God, whose Immensity the heavens and the earth cannot hold, wants the love of such things as we are! God wants our love, and is eager to be linked in the closest bonds of love with us. While man, who by an irresistible law of his nature is miserable without God—while man, by sin, ever since the dawn of creation, has been trying to creep further and further away from God—the great God Himself, Whose happiness is Himself, and Who can no more cease to be happy than He can cease to be God—has been incessantly striving to draw nearer and yet more near unto man, to bind man to Himself in the union of closest love.

There have been three great steps in God's love of human nature. Let us here briefly recall them to mind—these three stages of God's union with man[1]:

First, then, with Adam and Eve God lived in familiar intercourse, walking with them in the Garden of Paradise, and turning Eden thereby into a foretaste of heaven. Had not sin blighted human life and wrecked human nature, we all, perhaps, even during our mortal sojourn, should have conversed

[1] This idea is developed at length in the next lecture.

with God, as our first parents conversed with Him, and as Moses afterwards conversed with Him; for the Scriptures (Exod. xxxiii. 11) say that 'the Lord spoke unto Moses face to face, even as a man speaketh unto his friend.' But, alas! the first man and woman turned their backs on the gracious God, grossly insulted God, and allied themselves with God's arch-enemy, the devil. After that, you might have thought, God's answer to man's petitions for love would have bellowed in the earthquake, or crashed in the thunderbolt, or that armies of angels with fiery swords would have flashed from the skies to repel the rebel's presumptuous prayer for love.

Yet no! God replied by His second great proof of love. He entered on the second stage of closer and more intimate union with man. God so loved man that He sent His only-begotten Son to assume human nature. God became incarnate. God Himself became man. Here truly was a union that realized the four great requisites of love. For by the Incarnation, there is between God and man full knowledge of mutual love, and partnership in goods, and real equality, and perfect union.

The Incarnation fulfils the first condition of love. It proves to man that God loves him. For human nature, by the Incarnation, became God's nature; not, indeed, a Divine, but a divinized nature; and it is evident that God must love a nature that is His own. The Incarnation fulfils the second condition of love. It makes possible a community of possessions, a partnership in property, between God and man. Man has now something fit to offer God. For

the human actions of the Man Christ Jesus are the actions of a Divine Person, and have, therefore, an infinite value, and are in consequence right worthy even of God's acceptance. Again, the Incarnation fulfils the third condition of love. It puts man on a footing of something like equality with God. For the Incarnation raises man from the position of a serf and a slave, makes him the kinsman and brother of Christ, the son and heir of God. Lastly, the Incarnation fulfils the fourth condition of love. It establishes the closest union between God and man. For in Christ human nature is bound up with God in a union than which no closer is possible; in a union that is actual, substantial, inseparable; for the two natures of Christ, the human and the Divine, are linked together by the indissoluble bond of common personality, and that personality Divine, so that God can truly say: 'I am man'; and man, the Man Christ Jesus, can as truly say, 'I am God.'

Yet even the Incarnation did not satisfy the burning desire of the Mighty God for closest intimacy with man. Therefore God gave His third great proof of love. He entered on His third stage of union with man. He instituted the Blessed Sacrament. In the Incarnation God had united Himself directly with the nature of one man. In the Holy Eucharist He unites Himself directly with the natures of all men who will to receive Him.

The Holy Eucharist is the Incarnation perpetually present.

My Catholic brethren, when we approach Holy Communion, do we always clearly bear in mind

what splendid love God is therein manifesting for us? Do we always clearly remember who we are who receive, and who He is Whom we receive? The little white host is so silent, so motionless, so unresisting, that we are apt to forget what stupendous power lies hid beneath it. It is unresisting. The priest raises it and lowers it at will. It protests not. He lays it on the tongue of the saint, there is no voice of salutation. He lays it on the tongue of the sinner, there is no accent of complaint. The Sacred Host has the look, the taste, the odour, the weight of bread. Yet the substance of bread is not there. The substance of bread disappeared when the priest bowed down and uttered the words of consecration. The species, the accidents, the qualities, the outward indications of bread indeed remain—remain inherent in and supported by no substance — remain suspended, as it were, in being, by the efficient action of the all-powerful Will of God. Consecrated lips whispered the mystic words, and on the instant a marvellous effect was wrought. The living Body of the Man-God, Christ Jesus, was placed under that white vesture of the Host. The little disc of the Sacred Host is so motionless, and yet, within the tiny compass of that white shroud, lies hid the living, energizing Jesus, the whole Christ—Body, Soul, and Divinity.

There lies hid the Body of Christ, unextended, filling no space, without weight, incapable of measurement; and yet ordered, arranged, and rightly disposed, every part outside every other part, just as completely as when a Babe in Bethlehem He lay

in the Blessed Virgin's arms for the adoration of the three wise men from the East; just as completely as when grown to the full stature of man He stood radiant before His Maiden Mother's face, clad in all the splendour of His stately beauty, the perfect type of magnificent manhood, fairest among the sons of men.

There, too, coped in white of the sacred species, lies hid the human soul of Jesus; the same soul that when He walked on earth looked through His tender eyes, and spoke through His eloquent lips, and modulated the gentle tones of His melodious voice; the same soul that was in agony for your sake under the dark olive-trees in the moon-lit Garden of Gethsemane; the same soul that descended into Limbo, and led thence captivity captive; the perfect soul of Christ, with its powers of memory and intellect and will; with its faculty of memory, mindful of every fancy that has ever flitted across the mirror of your imagination; with its faculty of intellect, conscious of every thought that has ever graven or shall grave itself on the tablets of your mind in the past, present, or in the infinite future; with its faculty of will, yearning and craving for the love of each one of you, with vehemence and tenderness unspeakable.

Aye, and there, too, within the white circlet of the tranquil Host silently lies hid all the fiery energy of the Divinity, the unutterable Godhead, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and in company (or as theologians say, concomitantly) with Him, the Father and the Holy Ghost. In Holy Communion you receive on your tongue, you enshrine in your

heart, the Mighty God in Whose presence, as the Scripture says, the Kings of this earth are but as grasshoppers, and the nations are but as dust beneath His feet; at Whose voice the pillars of the heavens tremble; at Whose touch the mountains will crumble to pieces, and the heavens shrivel up like a parchment scroll thrust into the fire; before Whom cherubim and seraphim veil their faces with their wings, and night and day proclaim unceasingly: 'Holy! Holy! Holy!'

What a multitude of astounding miracles God is daily working in the Blessed Sacrament of the altar! And with what purpose?

Each one of us may reply: 'That He may satisfy His affection for me; that He may be united in closest bonds of love with me; that He may rest and reign in my heart. All this love of the throbbing heart of Christ Jesus is for me. It is for others also, but none the less on that account it is for me.' As St. Paul said: 'Christ loved me, and He gave Himself up to death for me.' There, truly, is salve for the stricken soul. There, surely, is balm for the bruised heart. Jesus, the Great God, sympathizes with me. Jesus, the Beautiful God, loves me. Jesus, the Eternal Wisdom, co-equal, co-eternal, consubstantial with the Father, God of God, Light of Light, True God of True God, infinite in all perfections; Jesus Who from all eternity has been the delight and fascination of the Father; Jesus, my Creator, my Redeemer, He Who justified me, He Who will glorify me; Jesus, my Teacher, my Master, my Friend, my Brother; this Jesus, He is also my

Lover. He comes to me in Holy Communion in a Sacred Host, which has been specially consecrated for me. It is not by chance that that particular Host comes to me. From all eternity God intended Himself in that Host for me, and rejoiced in the thought that in that Host He would perfect the union of love with me. Aye, He, the unspeakable God; He at Whose name every knee one day shall bow, of angels, of devils, and of men; He, the true 'Optimus Maximus,' the Greatest and the Best; He so loves me that He perfects the union of love by giving His adorable Self as Food to me. And just as natural food nourishes and sustains the natural life of the body, so does this supernatural Food nourish and sustain the supernatural life of the soul.

The Blessed Sacrament is the Food of your souls —'My Flesh is true Meat, and My Blood is true Drink'—though, unlike natural food, it does not change into you, it changes you into itself; it does not put on your qualities, it changes your qualities into its own. That is our Lord's own promise: 'He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.'

To-night, when at Benediction our Lord on His altar-throne is raised aloft to bless and sanctify you, make an earnest act of reparation, a splendid act of faith, a sublime act of love. Make an earnest act of reparation for the vulgar blasphemers who assail Jesus in the Holy Eucharist and clamour, like the contemptuous Jews of old, 'How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?' Say for these modern,

as Christ said for those ancient unbelievers: 'God forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Make a splendid act of faith: 'We have known and have believed that Thou art Christ, the Son of the Living God.' Make a sublime act of love. Cry in your heart, as cried the Psalmist of old: 'As the hunted stag panteth after the fountains of water, so doth my soul long for Thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for the strong Living God.' In the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, let this be ever our joyous watchword: 'Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis. Thou art the Great God, and praiseworthy exceedingly.' Amen.

LECTURE XVI

THE FOUR MANIFESTATIONS OF GOD IN MAN

THERE are to be four theophanies, or manifestations of God in man. Three of these are already accomplished. The fourth, for us, is yet to come. Three of these manifestations of God in the flesh have, I say, already been fulfilled. God manifested Himself in man, first in creation, secondly in the Incarnation, thirdly in the Eucharist. The fourth and greatest manifestation of all is the Beatific Vision of God in heaven.

I. THE FIRST MANIFESTATION—CREATION.

What, then, was the first manifestation of God in man? For ever God had reigned in the unbroken silence of eternity, alone, yet not alone—alone, for God is, by nature, One; yet not alone, for God is a three-fold Personality—when, out of pure goodness, He willed to create the wide universe, and to impart to creatures a share of that infinite happiness which is ever God's. The design of creation was not, indeed, a sudden conception. As long as God

had been God, the Divine Mind had contemplated the types and pondered the exemplar ideas of all things possible, as in endless hosts they marshalled themselves in the Divine Intellect, as in infinite variety they mirrored themselves in that ocean of being, the Divine Essence. From all eternity God's plans had been mapped out, and His counsels determined. From all eternity had gone forth that decree of creation which was to take effect in time. And when, in our human way of speaking, the appointed moment came, God's lips uttered the creative fiat, the omnipotent word, 'Let all things be,' went forth, and swifter than thought the vast universe out of nothingness leaped into being. At that imperious command this world of ours poised itself in space; the great disc of the sun flashed forth amid primeval gloom; the silvery moon began to circle in its orbit; the blue canopy of heaven twinkled with myriad lights, sown thicker than the daisies that fleck the green of a spring-tide meadow. And every kind of plant and animal filled land and air and river and sea. Thus God was no longer alone. The Divine Artist gazed on His handiwork, on the world in all its strength and beauty and variety and harmony; and God admired it all, for each of these creatures reflected, like a looking-glass, one small facet, one little phase, one finite aspect of the infinite perfections of the Creator. For in created things God is imaged and reflected—like one man's face in many diverse but imperfect mirrors. And God saw that they were good, and He admired them all.

Admired, I say, not loved. Love is between

persons, and as yet the universe was void of intelligence. It was without personality. It was a soulless thing. It had been made, not for itself, but for the sake of another (Deut. iv. 19). It was but a means to something else, and not an end in itself. It was made to be the dwelling-place of a higher being than itself, of one who should not only image the perfections of God, but should be a speaking likeness of God.

And God took of the dust of the earth He had created, and He moistened it, and this mire He moulded and formed and fashioned into the semblance of a new creature, a creature that should walk with brow erect to heaven; that should rule as King of the material universe; that should be dowered with reason, with the triple faculty of memory, intellect, and will; a rational creature gifted with intellectual freedom, and therefore gifted with capacity to pay to God the only worship really worth having, the worship of rational praise and reverence and service.

And, holding this new modelled creature in their hands, the Three Divine Persons counselled together and said: 'Let us make him to our own image and likeness.' And straightway God breathed in the face of this being so curiously wrought, and forthwith man awoke into vigorous life, a perfect being, perfect in body, perfect in mind, the image of Divinity. All things were made for man, and man was made for God. Man was the climax of the universe.

Such was the first manifestation of God in the flesh.

II. The Second Manifestation—The Incarnation.

But man spoiled God's design. He disobeyed. He rebelled. Wilfully man broke down the barriers against evil wherewith God had fenced him round about. Wantonly he let the flood-tide of sin rush into his soul. He ate of the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil. A knowledge of good God had implanted in man. A knowledge of evil man won for himself. And with the knowledge of evil came also the love of evil. What a fall was there! Adam poured the poison of sin into his own veins, and swiftly the venom coursed through his being, and shot to his heart, and destroyed him. It corrupted his whole nature. He had declared war against his Maker; he was punished by civil war within his own being. His intellect was darkened, his will warped, his passions let loose, and like a thunderbolt the doom of a double death fell upon him, temporal death of the body, eternal death of the soul. Adam, the head and representative of the race, sinned, and by that sin he blurred the likeness, and defaced the image, and blotted out the superscription of Divinity which God had deep stamped on human nature.

The creature had thwarted the Creator! And what was the Creator's vengeance? Did God in wrath resolve to seize the children of men, and binding them into bundles, like faggots for the burning, fling them into deep hell? No! God's ways are not man's ways, nor God's thoughts man's

thoughts. When man rebels against man, the victor clutches the vanquished, and stamps him out of existence. But the good God loved man, the work of His hands, too deeply for that. Man had waved God off; but God only drew the closer to man. Man had done much for ruin; but God did more for reparation. Man had refused to be the servant of God; in return, God made man to be the Son of God. Yes, to repair the fall, God sent the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity to become Incarnate of a Virgin and the Holy Ghost; to assume human nature; to become man.

The Divine Son of God, therefore, took human nature—the nature that had sinned—though without its sin. Leaving behind the human personality, God the Son assumed human nature, and linked it into a substantial union with the Divine Nature, under the common bond of the Divine Personality of the Son. Wherefore God could now say, 'I am Man;' and Man could now say, 'I am God.' God the Son became the Christ; one Person, yet two Natures; God and Man—God, because He has the Nature and Person of God; Man, because He has the nature, though not the person, of man.

Thus was accomplished the design of God to provide a Mediator for the redemption of fallen man. Human nature had sinned, and therefore human nature had to pay the penalty of that sin.[1]

[1] The measure of moral guilt is the difference of dignity between the offender and offended. When a common soldier strikes a fellow private, that is one offence; but if he strikes his King, it is another and a very different offence. The one is an

But the guilt of this sin was infinite, and, therefore, mere finite man could not atone for it. Only an infinite Being could satisfy for that guilt. The atonement must be made by man, because man's was the sin; and the atonement must be made by God, because God alone could expiate that sin. That was the problem, to find a Mediator who at once should be both God and man. And that problem God solved. The Almighty accomplished this synthesis of the finite and the Infinite, this substantial union of the creature and the Creator, this linking together of man and God by the bond of the Divine Personality. Thus Christ, as Man, paid the penalty of sin; and Christ, as God, made infinite atonement for sin. In this way the destruction man's rebellion had wrought, God's loving kindness more than repaired.

In creation, human nature had been made to the likeness of God. In the Incarnation human nature was made into the very substance of God. At the creation man had been able to say, 'I am the image of God.' At the Incarnation man was able to say, 'I am God.'

Such was the second manifestation of God in the flesh.

---

ordinary assault; the other is high treason. In both cases it is the same act *in substance*—the act of striking another—but the two acts differ vastly in their *term*. Hence, a moral offence is gauged by, not the substance, but the term of the offensive act. Therefore, as the difference between God and man is infinite, the moral guilt of Adam's sin was infinite. Not infinite in its substance; for man is finite, and the act, *in itself*, of a finite agent must of necessity be finite. But original sin was infinite in its term—*i.e.*, the Person offended—God.

III. The Third Manifestation—The Holy Eucharist.

Human nature had now been purged of sin, purified of taint, elevated, divinized, linked to the Person and Being of God. Yes, all this dignity had been conferred on human nature. 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt in us' (John i. 14, *in nobis*). God dwelt in the nature but not in the person of man.

Yet, each one of us may say, 'It is not so much the purgation of our common nature in Mary, the Immaculate Mother, and in Christ the God-Man which concerns me—me as a person, me as an individual. I marvel indeed at the beauty of purified humanity in them. In Mary I reverence and love it. In Christ I love and adore it. But I also yearn to share in it. In them my nature, as a man, has been ennobled; but in my nature, as an individual, I crave to share in that nobility. I, too, long to be personally united to God. Is that longing to be satisfied in this life?' Yes! How? By the Holy Eucharist. For mark how the first two manifestations of God in the flesh culminate in the Blessed Sacrament. In creation God had stamped His image and likeness on the mind of man; in the Eucharist God stamps Himself, Humanity, and Divinity upon the heart of man. In the Incarnation God had united Himself with human nature; in the Eucharist He unites Himself with the human individual. God in the Incarnation had made His home in the bosom of Mary the Virgin, pillowing

His head on her immaculate heart, and drawing food and sustenance from her. God in the Eucharist makes His home in the breast of each child of man who is willing to receive Him, resting His head again on the human heart, and giving Himself as the food and sustenance of man. Surely, then, you will say, this is the very ecstasy of Divine love! Aye, so deeply in love with the spotless humanity of Christ was Almighty God, that twice in transports of Divine joy He had flung wide open the windows of heaven, and to an astonished world had proclaimed: 'This is My Beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.' So deeply in love with the individuals in whom human nature was multiplied was the God-made Man, that when the time came for His departure from earth, He could not bear the thought of separation. His delight had been to dwell with the children of men, nor could he abide the thought of parting. He could not tear Himself away. Bitter is the parting of friend and friend. Bitter the parting of husband and wife. Bitter the parting of mother and child. But bitterer still was the parting of Christ from the men He loved with a love passing human understanding; so bitter, indeed, that God would not endure the pang of it. Go He must, and yet He was determined to stay. To tear Himself away from man was imperative, and yet He was resolved to tarry with man. He said: 'I will *not* leave you orphans. Because I live, ye too shall live. As I am in the Father, so shall ye be in Me, and I in you' (John xiv. 18).

Therefore, Christ miraculously multiplied His

presence, and though He ascended into heaven, He still remained on earth. He made His abode among the stars, but He also made His abode in every human breast that listed to give Him hospitality. He made Himself the Food of man, the Bread of life, and to every child of man who cries for that Divine Bread it shall be broken unto him. Christ by miracle indefinitely multiplied His presence, and as His Divinity is everywhere, so, too, by the words of consecration His Humanity may be everywhere. As the one voice of a speaker multiplies itself and is perfectly reproduced in the ears of innumerable listeners, so the one God-Man, Christ Jesus, multiplies Himself and is perfectly reproduced in the breasts of innumerable communicants. Christ made Himself the Food of man. What an act of love! Mothers ere now in the extremity of love have given part of their own flesh and blood as food to save the temporal life of their children. But Christ did more. To the children of men as food, to save their spiritual lives, Jesus gave Himself, whole and entire, body and soul, humanity and divinity. Who but God could have originated such a plan?

A false philosophy had, indeed, conceived a union of creature and Creator. Pantheism had conceived the idea of the Creator unfolding Himself and giving of His Substance for the making of the creature. But this evolution of the Creator into the creature had not elevated the creature; it had but degraded the Creator. It had not raised the creature to the level of the Creator; it had lowered the Creator to the level of the creature. Nothing, indeed, but

Infinite Wisdom could have thought out this design of the Eucharist, whereby Christ, true God and true Man, without detriment to His Divinity, without loss to His Humanity, could give Himself for the Food of the world.

And so Christ took bread and He took wine, and by Almighty power He annihilated the substance of bread, and He annihilated the substance of wine, while He left intact the accidents, the outer appearances, the size and weight and colour and taste, of both the one and the other; and where the substance of bread had been, He put His own divinized Body and Blood; and where the substance of wine had been He put His own divinized Blood and Body. That living Body remained one, though in many places, not broken, not divided, ever perfect, whole and entire:

> 'A sumente non concisus,'
> Non confractus, non divisus,
> Integer accipitur.'
> *From the 'Lauda Sion.'*

Under the appearance of bread and wine lie hid the Divine Body and Blood. As in a petrifying spring a piece of wood preserves the appearances of wood though the substance of wood is changed into stone, so in the Holy Eucharist a piece of bread preserves the appearances of bread though the substance of bread is changed into Christ's Body and Blood.

Twice, then, has God, the Infinite God, Whom heaven and earth cannot hold—twice has He set limits to His Immensity. In the Incarnation God diminished Himself to a span, manifesting Himself

in the guise of a new-born child. In the Eucharist God diminishes Himself to a speck, manifesting Himself in the guise of a wafer of bread. As in the tiny pupil of the human eye there can be imaged and reflected the whole body of a full-grown man; so in like manner, under the accidents of a morsel of bread, under the appearances of a drop of wine, is concentrated the whole living Body of Christ, not mutilated, not marred, perfect in every part, perfect in Humanity, perfect in Divinity.

What a compendium of miracles is the Holy Eucharist! They overpower the understanding. The head grows weary. The heart grows faint. The eyes are dazzled in presence of these sublime manifestations of God in the flesh. In the Incarnation God hid His Divinity. In the Eucharist He hides His Humanity. Let us develop this thought a little.

In the Incarnation God emptied Himself of His Divinity. As St. Paul says [Phil. ii. 6, 7]: 'Christ Jesus, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; yet emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as a man.' In creation man was made to the image of God. In the Incarnation God was made to the image of man. God, Who is a pure Spirit, in the Incarnation became a material body. God, Who is unbounded, in the Incarnation became limited to a definite place. God, Who is Infinite, in the Incarnation became finite; Who is eternal, became measurable by time; Who is invisible, became apparent to the eyes of men;

Who is immortal and impassible, became subject to pain and sorrow, to suffering and death. Such was the Incarnation.

After that thirty years passed away, and then God worked another prodigy even more stupendous than the Incarnation. He instituted the Blessed Sacrament. In the Incarnation God had emptied Himself of His Divinity; in the Eucharist He empties Himself of His Humanity. In the Incarnation God had put off the attributes of Divinity to put on the attributes of Humanity; in the Eucharist, He puts off the attributes of Humanity to put on afresh the attributes of Divinity. In the Incarnation, God, a pure Spirit, became a material body; in the Eucharist this material body of God becomes, as it were, spirit —existing whole and entire in every 'host,' and in every part of every 'host,' even as the human soul exists whole and entire in each and every part of the human body. In the Incarnation the Infinite became finite; in the Eucharist the Finite became infinite, so that it can exist in all places at one and the same time. In the Incarnation, the Invisible God became visible; in the Eucharist, the visible Man, Christ Jesus, becomes invisible. In the Incarnation an immortal Spirit becomes mortal; in the Eucharist a mortal Body has become immortal. In the Incarnation Spirit puts on the qualities of matter; in the Eucharist matter puts on the qualities of Spirit. The miracles of the Eucharist baffle the mind of man as much as the miracles of the Incarnation. Both overtop our understanding. For the miracles of the Eucharist are the antithesis of the miracles of

the Incarnation. The Incarnation had made mind to be like matter. The Eucharist makes matter to be like mind. But, it is objected by the amateur theologians—those keen and subtle logicians !—that we do not understand the Eucharist, and therefore that we ought to disbelieve it. I retort that we do not understand the Incarnation; ought we, therefore, to disbelieve it? If inability to understand tells against the Eucharist, it also tells with equal force against the Incarnation. If it does not tell against the Incarnation, neither does it tell against the Eucharist.

In the Blessed Sacrament Christ's Atonement for the fall of our first parents is completed and made perfect. Through the first Eve man fell; through Mary, the second Eve, man rose again. Through the first Adam man was doomed to spiritual death and the destruction of his body; through Christ, the second Adam, man was restored to spiritual life and was granted the resurrection of his body. Through eating forbidden food man incurred eternal death: 'In what day soever thou shalt eat of the tree thou shalt die the death' [Gen. ii. 17]. Through eating the food of Christ's Body and Blood man recovers eternal life: 'He that eateth My Flesh hath everlasting life' [John vi. 54]. Man was driven from Paradise, lest eating of the Tree of Life he should live for ever [Gen. iii. 22]. Now it is only by eating of the Tree of Life, which is Christ, that man can enter Paradise and live for ever. 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye shall not have life in you' [John vi. 54]. At the fall there was the

false promise that, by eating, man should become God: 'In the day ye eat of the tree, ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil' [Gen. iii. 5]. In the Eucharist there is the true promise that, by eating, man shall be assimilated to God: 'He that eateth My Flesh dwelleth in Me, and I in him' [John vi. 57]. After the fall God walked no more with man in the garden' [Gen. iii. 8]. In the Eucharist God abides night and day in the midst of men. At the fall man forgot God. The Eucharist is given as a perpetual memorial of God: 'Do this in remembrance of Me' [Luke xxii. 19].

IV. The Fourth Manifestation—The Beatific Vision.

'He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.' Live a holy life, a life sanctified by frequent union with Jesus in the Sacrament of Love, and there will be realized in you the fourth and last and highest manifestation of God in Man. In the three manifestations we have already touched on, our God has been a hidden God. But when the brief journey of this earthly life is over, and in the halls of heaven you stand face to face with the Christ Whom in Holy Communion you had so often received on your tongue and enshrined in your heart, the God-Man will fling aside His Eucharistic cloak of bread and wine and will stand forth in all the majestic splendour of the Godhead; and then, at last, you will see Jesus, no longer hidden under veils, no

longer as in a glass darkly, but face to face. You will gaze upon the face of Him Who is infinite Truth, infinite Goodness, infinite Beauty—the source and spring and origin of all created truth and goodness and beauty—compared with Whom all created perfections are less than are feeble rays of starlight glinting through the chinks of a dark chamber in comparison with the noontide tropical sun. For ever through your being the full tide of heavenly life will pulsate. Every power and faculty of your mind, ever satisfied yet never sated, will unceasingly be exercised with energetic and harmonious action in the contemplation and love of the perfections of God. Every rational desire of yours will be gratified. You will be filled with bliss to the very brim of your capacity. And this for ever! For all eternity! Never again, so long as God shall be God, shall even one tiny speck of cloud float across the skies to mar the heaven of your happiness. For ever you will stand face to face with the Origin of all happiness. For 'this is eternal life, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent' [John xvii. 3]. No man, indeed, can naturally see God and live. But in heaven God will strengthen the human soul to bear the ravishing vision of Divinity, that the spirit of man be not consumed by the splendour of the Infinite Majesty of God. Standing 'in that inaccessible light which God doth inhabit' [1 Tim. vi. 16], the blessed soul will be united in the fourth and closest union of love with God. In the Beatific Vision you will become like unto God. For just as in the light of the sun all things become

light like the sun ; so, standing in the Divine light of the Face of God, you will become, as it were, Divine. As iron thrust into the fire, though it does not lose the nature of iron, yet does put on the nature of fire ; so you, too, standing face to face with Christ in the fiery splendour of God, though you will not lose your nature as man, yet in a very true sense you will put on the nature of God ; you will be changed, as it were, into God. You will be made as St. Peter says : 'A partaker of the Divine nature' [2 Pet. i. 4]. As St. John says : 'When God shall appear, we shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is' [1 John iii. 2].

When God shall appear ! When God, now present here under Eucharistic veils in the tabernacle, shall reveal Himself to you face to face, that grand saying of the royal Psalmist [Ps. lxxxi. 6] will be verified of you : 'Ye are gods and sons of the Most High.'

THE END

R. AND T. WASHBOURNE, LTD., PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

64418